AUGSBURG COLLEGE LIBRARY
3 0510 02086 2878

# SELECTED QUOTATIONS ON PEACE AND WAR

COMMISSION ON CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

331
7880

**Augsburg Seminary**
**LIBRARY**

Any person who shall mark, mutilate, or otherwise injure this book, is liable by law to a heavy fine, or to a term of imprisonment, and in addition is liable to the Library for its full retail value.

It must not be lent by the person taking it out, who is responsible for it until it has been properly credited on its return.

BOOKS MAY BE RETAINED FOR FOURTEEN DAYS, EXCEPT "SEVEN DAY BOOKS" indicated by a red stamp on the book-pocket, the penalty for detention over time being two cents a day, holidays and Sundays not included.

The Free Church Book Concern
322 Cedar Ave., Minneapolis, Minn.

KEEP YOUR CARD IN THIS POCKET

Library

# SELECTED QUOTATIONS ON PEACE AND WAR

WITH ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO A COURSE OF LESSONS

ON

## INTERNATIONAL PEACE, A STUDY IN CHRISTIAN FRATERNITY

INCLUDED IN THIS VOLUME

COMPILED AND PUBLISHED

BY THE

COMMISSION ON CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

OF THE

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA

105 EAST TWENTY-SECOND STREET, NEW YORK CITY

331

Copyright, 1915, by

COMMISSION ON CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

OF THE

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA

JX
1937
F4

# CONTENTS

PAGE

List of Authors Quoted ..... vii

Concerning Contents and Purpose ..... xi

I. The Christian Ideal of World-Wide Fraternity ..... 1
- Common Fatherhood and Common Brotherhood ..... 1
- The Essential Worth of a Human Being ..... 10
- The Ideal Standpoint ..... 11
- Service for the Brotherhood ..... 18

II. Dangers in Modern Nationalism ..... 21
- False and True Patriotism ..... 21
- Individual and National Standards ..... 32
- National Dangers and National Defense ..... 39
- Militarism ..... 43
- National Neighborliness ..... 50
- Brotherhood—Good Samaritan ..... 53

III. The Character and Causes of War ..... 56
- What is War? (Defined) ..... 56
- What is War? (Described Rather Than Defined) ..... 57
- What is Peace? ..... 57
- Suggestive Points for Discussion ..... 60
- Characteristics of War ..... 61
- Can War be Right? ..... 65
- Common Fallacies in Regard to Armaments ..... 73
- Some Causes of War ..... 79
- Signs of Progress ..... 91

IV. The Consequences of War ..... 93
- Cost of War in Life, Property and Prosperity ..... 93
- Proportionate National Expenditures ..... 99
- Consequences to the Individual Soldier and to the Community ..... 102
- War Dangerous to the Race ..... 106
- Battle Cry of the Mothers ..... 108
- War Retards Human Progress ..... 110
- War Results in Loss of Energy ..... 113
- War Breaks Down the Moral Code ..... 115
- War a Means—Not an End ..... 118
- The Warlike Nation—the Decadent Nation ..... 119
- Unnatural and Irrational Selection Through War ..... 122



331

PAGE

V. The Moral Equivalents of War ..... 126
Changing Ideals ..... 126
A New Heroism ..... 130
A Progressive Attitude ..... 131
The Battle on Higher Ground ..... 134
Living for Country ..... 135
Heroic Living ..... 136
Substitutes for Military Virtues ..... 139
The Right Use of Force ..... 149
Moral Equivalents ..... 150

VI. Preventives of War, Arbitration ..... 159
Arbitration a Possibility and a Necessity ..... 159
Successful Arbitration ..... 163
The Development of Arbitration ..... 166
Syllabus on the Development of International Arbitration ..... 173
Historic Steps in Arbitration ..... 180
Hindrance to Arbitration ..... 185
Arbitration vs. Armaments ..... 188
Work of the Peace Conferences ..... 191
Permanent Tribunal ..... 194

VII. The Interdependence of the Nations ..... 206
Interdependence—a Reality To-day ..... 206
The Growth of Interdependence Desirable ..... 210
Changing Conditions ..... 214
International Cooperation ..... 221
Cooperation a Law of Life ..... 229
The Coming Day ..... 231

VIII. The Present Need of Interracial Appreciation and Good Will ..... 234
The Fatherland ..... 234
Better Racial Understanding ..... 235
Appreciation of the Japanese and Chinese ..... 245
Respect for Other Races ..... 258
Universal Race Congress ..... 265
Christian Obligations ..... 267

IX. World Federation, a Means of International Justice. 273
Justice Necessary to Peace ..... 273
Justice and Friendship ..... 281

PAGE

The Meaning of World Federation ..... 289
International Organizations ..... 294
The Need of International Law ..... 296
The World Court ..... 300
International Brotherhood ..... 302
International Union ..... 305
A League of Peace ..... 310

X. The Peace Movement and Other Peace Agencies .... 312
The Education of the People ..... 312
The Teaching of Heroism ..... 320
The Teaching of History ..... 327
The Intercollegiate Peace Association ..... 330
The Cosmopolitan Clubs ..... 332
The Christian Students' Federation ..... 334
The Development of the Peace Movement ..... 334
A Union of the Peace Press ..... 351
Literature of the Peace Movement ..... 353

XI. The Socializing of Christianity; The Spirit of Christ Permeating the Nations ..... 356
The Influence of the People ..... 356
The Social Life of the Nations ..... 370
Social Influence of Christianity ..... 377
Social Responsibility ..... 385
Strong Enough to Do Right ..... 387

XII. The Responsibility of the Christian ..... 392
A Psalm of the Helpers ..... 392
Each Man's Responsibility ..... 393
Individual Freedom ..... 399
Ideals Made Real ..... 400
A Higher Individual Standard ..... 406
Consecration to a Great Cause ..... 409

XIII. Christ the Ultimate Basis and Assurance of Permanent International Good Will ..... 412
The Call to the Church ..... 412
The Call to Ministers ..... 416
The Bible and Peace ..... 422
The Responsibility of the Church ..... 425
The History of the Church in Relation to Peace ..... 437
Resolutions of Churches ..... 441
The Song of Peace ..... 443

## CONTENTS—THE STUDIES


| LESSON | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| | Author's Preface | 447 |
| I. | The Christian Ideal of World-Wide Fraternity | 451 |
| II. | Dangers in Modern Nationalism | 458 |
| III. | The Character and Causes of War | 465 |
| IV. | The Consequences of War | 471 |
| V. | The Moral Equivalents of War | 479 |
| VI. | Preventives of War | 486 |
| VII. | The Interdependence of the Nations | 492 |
| VIII. | The Present Need of Interracial Appreciation and Good Will | 499 |
| IX. | World Federation a Means of International Justice | 506 |
| X. | The Peace Movement and Other Peace Agencies | 513 |
| XI. | The Socializing of Christianity; The Spirit of Christ Permeating the Nations | 520 |
| XII. | The Responsibility of the Christian | 527 |
| XIII. | Christ the Ultimate Basis and Assurance of Permanent International Good Will | 533 |

# LIST OF AUTHORS QUOTED


Abbott, Lyman 184, 185, 274, 288
Addams, Jane 111, 127, 139, 241, 262, 285, 436
Adler, Felix 12, 212, 270, 395, 402
Ainslie, Peter 50, 100
Angell, Norman 34, 36, 132, 199, 210, 213, 215, 216, 225, 357, 400
Asquith, H. H. 427

Baldwin, Simeon E. 200, 301, 356
Barlow, Hon. Lady 4, 359
Baty, T. 305
Beals, Charles E. 390
Beecher, Henry Ward 313
Birney, Lauress J. 267
Bloch, Jean de 99, 101
Boardman, George Dana 13, 131
Bourne, Randolph L. 175, 186
Bracq, Jean C. 67
Bradford, Amory H. 1, 11, 14, 19, 166, 379
Brewer, David J. 43, 267, 360
Bridgman, Raymond L. 3, 6, 211, 293, 300, 425
Brooks, Phillips 134
Broido, Louis 165
Brown, Charles R. 75, 425
Browning, E. B. 130
Bruce, Sir Charles 407
Bryan, William J. 137, 312
Burke, Edmund 394
Burton, Ernest D. 248
Butler, Nicholas Murray 18, 188, 198, 283, 284

Caldecott, Alfred 268
Call, Arthur Deerin 349
Capen, Samuel B. 96, 387
Carnegie, Andrew 61, 65, 102, 104, 162, 187, 303, 387
Channing, William Ellery 10, 84, 88, 102, 274, 357, 399
Chittenden, Hiram M. 299
Clifford, John 328, 436
Constant, Baron d'Estournelles de 269
Courtney, Lord, of Penwith 274
Crosby, Ernest H. 59, 105

Davids, T. W. Rhys 18
Derby, Earl 302
Dodge, David Low 396

Dole, Charles F. 359, 371
Ede, W. Moore 432

Ellis, Havelock 277, 292
Emerson, Ralph Waldo 28

Faunce, W. H. P. 206, 229
Ferrero, Guglielmo 385
Fiske, John 406
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles 164, 195
Fried, Alfred H. 351
Foster, John W. 160

Gannett, William C. 201, 308
George, Henry 274
George, Lloyd 101
Gibbons, Cardinal 4, 163
Gilbert, George Holley 19, 420, 422
Gilder, Richard Watson 136
Ginn, Edwin 314, 395
Gladden, Washington 1, 13
Gordan, George A. 1
Gould, F. J. 321
Grane, William Leighton 27, 29, 61, 148, 164, 212, 289, 384, 389, 408, 414, 416, 421
Grant, Ulysses S. 301
Greer, David H. 412
Grey, Sir Edward 161, 183
Gulick, Sidney L. 254, 420

Haldane, Viscount, of Cloan 364
Harris, George 53, 208
Hart, Albert Bushnell 318, 329
Henderson, Charles Richmond 356, 374, 393
Hirst, Francis W. 91, 135, 167, 197
Hobson, J. A. 79
Holt, Hamilton 298, 310
Howard, Rowland B. 65, 72
Hoyt, John W. 4
Hugo, Victor 231
Hull, William I. 302
Hunter, Dorothy M. 407

James, William 150
Jefferson, Charles E. 39, 44, 73
Jefferson, Thomas 213
Jones, Augustine 90, 346
Jones, Jenkin Lloyd 157, 320, 410
Jordan, David Starr 61, 70, 105, 113, 119, 240, 254, 289, 394

Kellogg, Vernon L. 106, 263
King, Henry Churchill 1, 237, 263
Knox, Philander C. 217
Krehbiel, Edward Benjamin 173

Ladd, George Trumbull 245, 389
La Fontaine, Henri 334

Lammasch, Heinrich 175
Lawrence W. 261
Lecky, W. E. H. 87
Lee, Robert E. 135
Lochner, Louis P. 330, 332, 334
Lodge, Oliver 113, 206
Low, Seth 235
Lowell, J. R. 61, 126, 234
Lubin, David 221, 222
Lynch, Frederick 21, 138, 180, 230, 276, 370, 378

Mabie, Hamilton Wright 10, 50, 412
Macdonell, Sir John 242, 258, 266, 269, 323
Mackenzie, J. S. 4
Malcolm, Howard 43
Mann, H. 99
Markham, Edwin 11
Mathews, Shailer 257, 278, 394, 413, 415, 428
Mead, Edwin D. 46, 63, 319, 324, 342, 343, 353
Mead, Lucia Ames 41, 78, 80, 91, 99, 219, 265, 327, 347
Merrill, P. M. 38
Moneta, E. T. 57, 70
Moore, 56
Morgan, Angela 108
Morley, John Lord, of Blackburn 80, 395
Morris, Victor 327, 396, 398
Muzzey, David Saville 21, 23
Myers, Denys P. 159, 191, 203, 376
Myers, Philip Van Ness 176, 236, 264, 302

Nabuco, Joaquin 260
Neill, Charles Patrick 97, 98
Newman, T. P. 221
Novicow, Jacques 68, 97, 107, 112, 118

Osborne, John Ball 218, 223, 224

Paish, Sir George 214, 215
Penn, William 301
Perry, A. L. 97
Pezet, Señor Don Federico Alfonso 304
Politis, N. 196
Pratt, Hodgson 317
Pratt, Sereno S. 111

Ralston, Jackson H. 30, 71, 283
Rauschenbusch, Walter 259, 280, 359, 377, 381, 387, 405
Reinsch, Paul S. 296
Remensnyder, Junius B. 434
Richards, Henry 436
Richter, Adolph 76, 189
Richter, Jean Paul 412
Roberts, E. S. 422

Roberts, George E. 422
Rogers, Henry Wade 181
Root, Elihu 80, 83, 273, 282, 283, 313
Root, Robert C. 328
Roots, L. H. 318
Rowe, L. S. 261, 262
Rowley, Francis H. 428
Ruskin, John 90, 318, 364
Russell, Lord 162

Schermerhorn, M. K. 443
Schücking, Walter 171
Scott, James Brown 194, 196
Seligman, Isaac N. 110
Sergi, Giuseppe 262
Sharpless, Isaac 150
Smith, Paul 135
Speer, Robert E. 6
Stead, William T. 273, 307, 318
Stobart, M. A. 112
Stratton, George M. 37, 129
Sumner, Charles 23, 32, 138, 390, 394, 421
Sumner, William Graham 122
Suttner, Baroness von 274

Taft, William Howard 186
Teggio, Victor 165
Tennyson, Alfred 117
Thomas, Reuen 136, 149, 397, 409
Thorndike, Edward L. 141
Tolstoi, Leo N. 54
Trueblood, Benjamin F. 3, 96, 167, 177, 179, 208, 307, 335, 379
Tryon, James L. 294

Van Dyke, Henry 19, 392

Walsh, Walter 115, 116, 117, 329, 385, 431
Warner, H. E. 28, 33, 130
Washington, George 281
Webster, N. 63
Weisman, Russell 163
Wheeler, E. J. 126
Wilson, William E. 11, 51, 181, 379, 437
Wilson, Woodrow 206, 228
Worcester, Noah 93

## CONCERNING CONTENTS AND PURPOSE

The literature on peace and war has multiplied rapidly during the recent past. In consequence, only a few organizations especially interested in the promulgation of peace principles have attempted to keep in close touch with all the significant utterances on the subject that have appeared in print. Among these few the Church Peace Union, at New York City, and the World Peace Foundation, at Boston, are noteworthy examples, the library and record files of both organizations being among the most complete archives of current peace literature in this country. To the rich fund of source materials at the disposition of these two organizations the Commission on Christian Education of the Federal Council of Churches is largely indebted for the Selected Quotations on Peace and War contained in this volume. A brief statement regarding the contents and purpose of the compilation will make evident its value as a permanent reference volume for pastors, teachers, and thoughtful students.

More than a year ago the Commission on Christian Education, cooperating with the Church Peace Union and with the educational committees and publishing houses of the various denominations affiliated with the Federal Council of Churches, entered upon a campaign of education on the subject of world-wide peace, basing its appeal on the Christian ideal of the universal brotherhood of man and the world-wide scope of Christ's kingdom. This cooperative educational effort resulted in the preparation of a connected series of brief studies on the Christian principles involved in interracial sympathy and good will, such as are fundamental to a permanent world peace. The studies are intended especially for adult Bible

classes, young people's societies, missionary and fraternal organizations, and other interested adult groups. Their simultaneous publication (during October to December of 1915) in the various senior and adult Sunday-school periodicals and other church publications of the cooperating denominations has resulted in assuring for this particular course of lessons wide publicity and an actual circulation of more than two millions.

The task of writing these lessons was entrusted by the Commission to Professor Norman E. Richardson, of Boston, in collaboration with a special committee on peace instruction appointed by the Commission and consisting of Norman E. Richardson, Chairman; Francis E. Clark, B. S. Winchester, Charles H. Levermore, Wilbur K. Thomas, P. H. J. Lerigo, Charles S. Macfarland, and the undersigned. Miss Frederica Beard served as special assistant to Professor Richardson, while to Denys P. Myers, Librarian of the World Peace Foundation, was entrusted the task of preparing a selected bibliography covering the various subjects presented in the peace studies. The publication of this bibliography in connection with the lesson titles and Scripture references of the lessons on "International Peace—A Study in Christian Fraternity," resulted in a widespread demand for the literature indicated in the bibliography. The effort to make the more significant utterances included in the sources cited in this bibliography available to the general public resulted in the preparation of this volume of selected quotations.

For the actual work of arranging the material under the running titles used in this volume credit is due to Miss Beard, while the responsibility for a critical editorial supervision has been borne by Professor Richardson in cooperation with Dr. Winchester, acting for the Commission on Christian Education. The quotations in this volume, while chosen primarily with reference to the course of lessons on International

Peace, to which reference has been made, have nevertheless been extensively supplemented by quotations from more recent discussions which have appeared in print since the work of writing these lessons was completed. For purposes of reference and study the lessons referred to have been included as an appendix to this volume. The book, however, will have a value independent of the lessons as a source-book of expressions from noted thinkers on peace and war, especially as viewed from the Christian standpoint.

HENRY H. MEYER,
Secretary, Commission on Christian Education,
Federal Council of Churches.

New York, September, 1915.

## CHAPTER I

## THE CHRISTIAN IDEAL OF WORLD-WIDE FRATERNITY

We believe in the Universal human Brotherhood. The crusade of Brotherhood is the most remarkable and prophetic of all the social movements of the modern world.

—Amory H. Bradford.

### COMMON FATHERHOOD AND COMMON BROTHERHOOD

Humanity is here and God is here and the glory of Jesus Christ lies in the light that he has poured upon both. He has taught us that the final truth about man is life in the fellowship of love; he has taught us that this fellowship on earth is possible because of the ineffable fellowship of love in God.

In the presence of God's world-plan all men are one. We are one in origin, in fortune, and in destiny.

—George A. Gordon.

I wish we might take home to ourselves this one thought that God is our Father and that we are his children. Our Father—the Father of us all! . . . The Father not only of patriarchs and prophets, of saints and martyrs, of the holy and excellent of the earth, but the Father of publicans and sinners, of heathen men and criminals, of the vilest and the worst just as truly as of the purest and the best. It is the one word that we have to speak to all sorts and conditions of men—the one message which every messenger of God has to deliver—God is your Father, you are all his children.

—Washington Gladden, Present Day Theology, p. 36.

The thought of God as Father, or, in ethical terms, of love

at the heart of the world, is the basic assumption in the entire Sermon on the Mount, and permeates its teaching throughout, explicitly recurring, again and again. . . .

God is Father. Love cannot be partial. Therefore, also, life is a marvelous unity, and sin is its own worst punishment and love its own best reward. The power of a consistent love is ours. . . .

God is Father. Therefore every man is a child of God, like us, knit up in life with us. The power of a gracious love is ours. God is Father. And love is life. Love, infinite and eternal, is at the heart of things. We can think and still live at the same time, because it is given us to start from this primal faith in the love of God. The power of a godlike love is ours. . . .

It seems to Jesus to be an inevitable inference from the thought that God is Father—that is, that there is love at the very heart of the world—that men should necessarily think of one another as brothers, all alike children of the Father, and to be treated and loved as such. The motive is not the less powerful that it seems with Jesus so incidental; rather is it incidental because it carries inevitable force with it.

If I am to love men, then, I need to believe that they are my brothers, that is (1) that the life of every man is knit up indissolubly with my own; (2) that he is like me; and (3) that in some true sense he has a sacred and priceless personality in Jesus's thought—is a child of God. Then I cannot wish to kill or hate or despise or condemn him. . . .

*Summary:*

1. The lives of men are indissolubly knit up together—"members one of another"—inevitably, desirably, indispensably.

2. The other man is very like us—in all the great essentials of nature, in cherishing some ideals, with like limitations, and temptations and struggles.

3. The other man has like us a personality—sacred and infinitely valuable (a child of God), worthy of patient, long-suffering, self-sacrificing love.

—Henry Churchill King, The Ethics of Jesus, pp. 243-254. (The Macmillan Co., Publishers.)

God "made of one every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth." The oneness of origin and descent of the various peoples of the globe is now established with practical certainty on purely scientific grounds. The race is one race also in constitution. The human body, of black or white, of red or yellow, is the same in structure, in purpose and in needs, the world over. The human mind is everywhere built on the same pattern. The highest man and the lowest man can learn each other's language and commune with each other intellectually. Human feelings in all individuals and in all races are the same feelings, however they may vary in degree or manner of expression. Pleasure and pain, joy and grief, hope and fear, love and hate, are the same affections wherever experienced. The power of moral determination, though varying widely in its range of activity, is operative in all men, and the capacity for the same moral ideals is likewise everywhere found. This constitutional unity of the race is practically meaningless on any other theory than that of cooperation and mutual service in working out the destiny of each and all.

—Benjamin F. Trueblood, The Federation of the World, pp. 7, 8.

For practical purposes, for the truth as to the fitness of men to work and to live together, for the truth regarding their mutual rights and duties, for a sound position regarding their fundamental equality as individual free wills, it is safe to proceed on the theory that mankind is one in origin, and

that the unity into which the individuals are created is a stronger centralizing force than any diversity caused by color, climate, language, religion, or social condition.

—Raymond L. Bridgman, World Organization, p. 3.

Above all nations is humanity.

—Plato.

*The essential likeness of various races and classes is evident in spite of superficial difference.* Such points of difference may generally be shown to be largely the results of diverse physical and social conditions; and an attempt should be made to bring out and emphasize this fact. The study of the history and literature of different countries helps powerfully toward this recognition of a common humanity under a great variety of forms. It is one of the chief arguments for the retention of Latin and Greek in our schools, not indeed as universally compulsory subjects, but as important elements in a liberal education.

*Different people, different classes, have each a distinct type of personality with a distinct value of its own.* The study of history calls attention to the solid excellences by which great peoples, such as the Greeks and Romans, have been characterized, and also brings out the fact that those who are politically subject are not always inferior in some important human qualities that win our admiration. The Greeks are not the only race who, in one way or another, have conquered their conquerors. It would be easy to show that England may learn much from her dependencies in India, Africa, and elsewhere. Indeed, it is in the attempt to educate and assimilate subject-races that the emphasis on fundamental qualities of character becomes specially important.

*Identity and comprehensive character of the human ideal as evolved in a number of different forms may be pointed out*

*by showing* that the ideals of every race are tentative and partial, and thus become enriched, completed, unified, and purified by mutual help and mutual criticism. Among other things, the study of the great religions of the world, in outward appearance so diverse, may be used to show that they all contain the same fundamental truths in more or less imperfect forms.

—J. S. Mackenzie, Inter-Racial Problems, pp. 433-439.

Brotherhood is the great truth which has come from above, the sublime and beautiful truth which Christ gave to the world and upon which He founded his religion, a religion which has often been perverted with followers devoted to the teaching of dogmas to the neglect of these broad truths of humanity. It is well for us to take up anew and come back to this great central truth in the interest of mankind. "Ye have heard it has been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy, but I say unto you, Love your enemies; love thy neighbor as thyself."

—John W. Hoyt, in Report of the Fifth Universal Peace Congress, p. 226.

The Word of Jesus: "One is your Father, all ye are brethren."

—Matt. 23:9, 8.

Behind all arguments lies the fundamental truth that every human being, regardless of class and color and sex, is the living temple of the Spirit, and therefore we dare not lay hands in violence upon one another.

—Hon. Lady Barlow.

Religion, I hold, is the only solid basis of society. Religion

is to society what cement is to a modern building; it makes all parts compact and coherent. The social body is composed of individuals who have constant relations with one another, and the very life and preservation of society demand that the members of the community discharge toward one another various and complex duties. Religion teaches me that we are all children of the same Father, brothers and sisters of the same Redeemer, and, consequently, members of the same family. It teaches me the brotherhood of humanity.

—Cardinal Gibbons.

Religion, science, art—exponents of the good and the true, the beautiful—all affirm unity of mankind.

—R. L. Bridgman.

If one were asked to name in a single word for each one of the great religions of the world its central and essential principles, he would not, perhaps, have any great difficulty in the case of Confucianism. A question like this was once addressed to Confucius and he is said to have replied with the counter-question, as to whether "reciprocity" was not such a word. And perhaps it would not be difficult in the case of Buddhism, where most Buddhists themselves, I imagine, would recognize at once the word "Nirvana" as summing up their central principle and desire—the word that we might translate best in English, perhaps, by our word "rest" or even "extinction." Perhaps also Mohammedans would not find this a difficult task. I presume most of them would reply in the term which they apply to their own religion, "Islam," which may be weakly translated into English by the word "submission" or "surrender." Doubtless it would be more difficult in the case of Hinduism, but I presume a great majority of Hindus would answer without much hesitation with the word "Karma," or "fate," or "destiny,"

although there might be some who would disagree and prefer some other term.

Certainly, in the case of Christianity, one would meet a great variety of answers from Christian men. But, for my part, I should have no hesitation whatever, in determining the central word; I should say that, in place of reciprocity, or rest, or surrender, or destiny, the central and essential principle of Christianity would be defined by the word *unity,* at-one-ment. As we turn back and look at our Lord's life and listen to His teaching, that seems to me to have been His central message. His own life was a unity. Set over against the jarring disharmony of men's lives, His life made one perfect music. The great purpose of His coming, as He said, was to draw men together into oneness—to show that it was possible for a man to live a united life with God and to draw all men together unto Himself. His great prayer was that men might be united—so that His disciples and all other peoples throughout the world might become one, even as He and His Father were one. So that if we desire to know, in one single word, what was the heart of His message, what the purpose of His coming, and what to be the result of His mission, I think we should find it best in this single word "unity."

Jesus Christ came with this message of unity regarding man and God: offering to every man the sweetness of an unbroken and cloudless fellowship with His Father who is also ours. Our Lord never addressed God in any other term than Father, barring once, when in the anguish of death He quoted a verse from the forty-second Psalm, "My God! My God! Why hast thou forsaken me?" Every other time that Jesus spoke to God He called him Father: Father, my Father, righteous Father, and He taught men that they were to speak to God and of God just as He had spoken, and that a man might think of God as his own Father, and that when

he was alone he might talk with God just as he would talk to his father.

The gospel of Christ was a message of unity also between man and man. The first thing that our Lord did, when He began His work on earth, was to establish friendship, to invite men to come and join His companionship. He drew men near to Him and thus nearer to one another. The organized company of apostles was a loving and intimate brotherhood and the last great commandment that He gave them was, what? "That ye also love one another even as I have loved you." Our religion began as a relationship of love among men, the bringing together of men of different affiliations, different types of character, different temperaments, into one "beloved community," on united brotherhood. And when our Lord had gone away that was what He left behind him. He was not zealous to leave a ritual; He had no anxiety to organize a society; He never formally called the little band He left behind a church; all that He did was to gather together a company of men who were joined together as a brotherhood, and they constituted a community into whose hands He passed on His work and His mission when He was gone. And the fundamental reality regarding the Christian church, as this community came to be called, was, that it was a true and united social fellowship.

It has been said by a German ethnologist that the deepest saying of Saint Paul had reference to these very things. You remember that word of his in which he declared that in Christ Jesus the three great lines of cleavage were all obliterated—the line of sex, the line of race, and the line of class. In Jesus Christ there was universal citizenship, no native and foreigner, no male and female, no bond and free, but all were to be one in Him. These differences are precisely the cause of the great problems in our modern world: racial prejudice and injustice, inequality of right and privi-

lege between men and women, alienation between poor and rich, hatred and cleavage between class and class. I remind you that it was the indisputable fact regarding the life of the early Christian church that every one of these three great lines of cleavage that God hates and that have cursed human life was wiped out by Jesus Christ, and that He came into the world to strike out these lines of cleavage, even to the very end of the age and the uttermost bounds of the world.

If you think I am overdrawing this element of unity as characteristic of Christianity in the early beginning and intended to dominate through time, let me quote to you the statement of Paul in the second chapter of Ephesians: "Now in Christ Jesus ye that once were far off are made nigh in the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who made both one, and brake down the middle wall of partition, having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; that he might create in himself of the two one new man, so making peace, and might reconcile them both in one body unto God through the cross, having slain the enmity thereby; and he came and preached peace to you that were far off, and peace to them that were nigh, for through him we both have our access in one Spirit unto the Father."

I say again that the message that Jesus Christ brought into the world was a message of unity to the individual man, a message of unity in man's relationship to God, and a message of unity as to man's relationship to his brother. Every organization inside our universities that abridges brotherhood, that denies unity, is alien to the mind and spirit of Jesus Christ. Every prejudice and class partisanship and narrowness of view and of sympathy in our nation between class and class, race and race, between black man and white man, between capitalist and laborer, between poor man and rich man—every such separation and prejudice is a direct

affront and repudiation of the spirit of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Every chasm across humanity that separates a Hindu brother from me, every chasm in the world that divides any race from any other race by barriers of disunion and prejudice and hatred—every such chasm and barrier is a denial of the mind and spirit of Jesus Christ.

Was there ever a day in the history of the world when men needed to see this more clearly than to-day, to realize what the mission of Christianity in the world really is? The issue of Christianity is not an optional matter for a man to be interested in, or to pass by as he shall please. It is the whole issue of the unity of his life, of his right relationship with God, which, as Jesus Christ said, is life, and of the solution of the central problem of the modern world.

—Robert E. Speer, Address on International Peace.

## THE ESSENTIAL WORTH OF A HUMAN BEING

"Unto me hath God showed that I should not call any man common or unclean."

On the faces of his sorrowing, toiling fellow workers, he saw the image of God slowly dawning like a glorious morning out of mist and darkness as they touched the stuff of mortality with the power and beauty of the immortal.

—Hamilton Mabie, Parables of Life, p. 80.
(The Macmillan Company, Publishers.)

A new reverence for man is essential to the cause of social reform. There can be no spirit of brotherhood, no true peace, any farther than men come to understand their affinity with and relation to God and the infinite purpose for which He gave them life. None of us can conceive the change of manners, the new courtesy and sweetness, the mutual kindness, deference, and sympathy, the life and energy of efforts for social melioration, which are to spring up, in proportion as

man shall penetrate beneath the body to the spirit, and shall learn what the lowest human being is. Then insults, wrongs, and oppressions, now hardly thought of, will give a deeper shock than we receive from crimes which the laws punish with death. *Then man will be sacred in man's sight*, and to injure him will be regarded as open hostility toward God.
—William Ellery Channing, Discourses on War, p. 3.

"The crest and crowning of all good, life's final star is brotherhood;
For it will bring again to Earth her long-lost Poesy and Mirth;
Will send new light on every face, a kingly power upon the race.
And till it come, we men are slaves, and travel downward to dust of graves.
Come, clear the way, then, clear the way; blind creeds and kings have had their day.
Break the dead branches from the path: our hope is in the aftermath.
Our hope is in heroic men, star-led to build the world again.
To this event the ages ran: Make way for Brotherhood—make way for man."

—Edwin Markham.

Before prejudice will disappear and brotherhood will be regnant and enduring there must come into commerce and industry, as well as into philosophy and theology, a larger and truer conception of the value of man.
—Amory H. Bradford.

## THE IDEAL STANDPOINT

I suppose if one were asked for an epitome of Christ's teaching one would read aloud the Sermon on the Mount; its keyword is for the nations, *peace;* for the individual, *love*. . . .

Christ at His coming into the world brought peace with Him, so at His departure He left peace as an everlasting

legacy. God the Father has chosen to call Himself the king and father of peace, His kingdom the kingdom of peace, His servants the sons of peace.

The ideal set before us by Jesus Christ is high, but that must neither be a cause for despair nor a reason for lowering the standard. For Jesus Christ did not set before us the ideal without Himself making it real in His own life. And the power by which He lived is at the disposal of every one of His followers. *We are not expected to live the Christian life without the Christian power. The spirit of Jesus is able to transform the world, but it cannot do this while the people through whom it ought to work, the followers of Christ, acquiesce in a lower ideal than that which He showed us. . . .*

—William E. Wilson, Christ and War, p. 52.

We desire peace with the Brotherhood, but why? This is the most pertinent question of all. Is it for the multiplication of the sources of material enjoyment? Is it for the development of culture?—and if so, is it for the development of a single type of civilization—Western civilization, for instance? And is this to be extended universally, suppressing every other type?

The appeal of sympathy alone will not suffice. Sympathy is in its nature fluctuating, and in larger groups of men as well as in individuals, it is apt to alternate with the hardest kind of selfishness, nor will the waste of war and the impoverishment that follows in its train serve as a deterrent. In moments of passion, a kind of frenzy is apt to be generated; all considerations of advantage are apt to be thrown to the winds; and all the arguments that an enlightened selfishness can produce are addressed to deaf ears. Nor will the growth of democracy prove a sufficient safeguard against the plague of war. On the contrary, a novel peril

appears in the contagious rapidity with which emotional excitement is propagated among crowds. A stronger motive is needed; one that will appeal, not so much to ephemeral feeling or to the baser selfish instincts as to the most permanent and the loftiest of human interests. Not peace itself, but the ends which peace is to subserve, should be held up to view.

—Felix Adler, The Fundamental Principle of Inter-Racial Ethics in Inter-Racial Problems, p. 263.

We shall never get beyond Saint Paul's fundamental conception of the ideal society, to wit, this: "WE ARE MEMBERS ONE OF ANOTHER." Accordingly, what mankind needs is the sense of what our French brothers call *esprit de corps.* And this *esprit de corps,* this sense of mankind, comes to mankind only through the avenue and in the sphere of the Christian incarnation, or the embodiment of God in Jesus of Nazareth.

—George Dana Boardman, in Report of Fifth Universal Peace Congress, p. 220.

We are told, in the Book of Genesis, that man is made in the image of God; and the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God, on which the entire teaching of Jesus rests, is but a stronger statement of the same truth. It is true that we find human nature, as yet, for the most part, in very crude conditions; its divine qualities are not clearly seen. It does not yet appear what we shall be. But we have learned, in our evolutionary studies, that no living thing ought to be judged in the earlier stages of its development; we must wait to see the perfected type before we can make up our minds about it. The eaglet just hatched does not give us the right idea of the eagle, nor does the infant in his swaddling clothes reveal to us the man. So it is with species and races; if

they are undergoing a process of development, we must wait for the later stages of the process before we judge. The apple is not the crab, but the Northern Spy; the horse is not the mustang, but the Percheron or the German roadster. In estimating any living thing, you take into consideration its possibilities of development; the ideal to which it may attain must always be in sight.

In the same way when we think of man, we do not take the Patagonian as the type, but the best specimens of European or American manhood.

If, then, we are taught to believe that man is a child of God, we should be compelled to believe that it is the most perfectly developed man who most resembles God. We have some conception of the ideal man. Our conceptions are not always correct, but they are constantly improved, as we strive to realize them. And in the ideal man we see reflected the character of God.

—Washington Gladden, The Church and Modern Life, pp. 23, 24.

## MY BROTHER—A DIALOGUE

MISANTHROPOS

PHILANTHROPOS

*Mis.*—Do you not think that there is a great deal of nonsense in the current talk of platform and pulpit about Brotherhood? We are getting it *ad nauseam* from a certain class of sentimental speakers and writers—chiefly from those who lack courage to declare themselves as Socialists—but who wish to win the favor of the multitude. For my part, I think that that young man was right who denounced Brotherhood as a failure. . . .

*Phil.*—You take too gloomy a view of current conditions. I cannot at all agree with you. Instead of interpreting events

as you do, I believe that the spirit of Brotherhood is penetrating and pervading the whole social order. We must begin by defining terms. Will you tell me, my dear Misanthropos, what you mean by Brotherhood?

*Mis.*—By Brotherhood I mean the relation of mutual love and service. The word was never better defined than by Jesus in the so-called Golden Rule. Men who do unto one another as they would be done by are brothers. Jesus at another time said, "A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another." The apostle John also wrote, "He that loveth not his brother"—that is, his fellow man—"whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" The Christian teaching defines Brotherhood as the recognition of the obligation of mutual love and service. It offers a beautiful but utterly impracticable ideal.

*Phil.*—And do you mean to say, my dear Mis., that you think that Brotherhood is impossible; and that it is not only making no headway, but that it has little recognition anywhere?

*Mis.*—Exactly! It has existence in words, and in them alone. It is a dream. It never has been realized, and never can be realized. . . .

*Phil.*—It would, of course, be folly to claim that the human race is now, or ever has been, dominated by brotherly feeling; but even a cursory study of history shows that those feelings have, year by year, gained a larger place in the affairs of men. There has been a growing appreciation of the value of man as man. Laws have become more humane; the death penalty is now inflicted for only a few crimes, and is difficult of infliction because even the courts hesitate to put an accused person beyond the reach of self-justification. In the old days hospitals and asylums were unknown, and weakness was regarded as a disgrace rather than as a misfortune, but now

even monarchies like Germany and Great Britain have inaugurated comprehensive schemes of old-age pensions. Communism, socialism, nihilism are more or less frantic efforts on the part of the masses of the people to realize what they believe to be the true human condition—one in which the welfare of man shall be secured. Every Thanksgiving Day and, still more, every Christmas Day are wonderful revelations of the progress of humanity toward the realization of Brotherhood. . . .

*Mis.*—Suppose you are correct: and suppose the tide of Brotherhood is rising and will become resistless—to what do you ascribe this new movement in human history? Do you think that it is exclusively a Christian movement?

*Phil.*—I should much rather call it a cosmic movement. The causes of humanity surely received a new impetus from the life and teaching of Jesus; but even he had no monopoly of Brotherhood. Its finest fruits and richest growths are no doubt found in lands nominally Christian, but rather than call it exclusively a Christian movement I would say that it is the result of evolution, because it may be seen in a greater or lesser degree in nearly every land. By evolution, as I have said before, I mean the working out of a divine plan under the influence of the providence of God. The greatest single force in the upward progress of the race has been the gracious presence, the beneficent teaching, the glorious example of the Elder Brother; but humane feelings have been from the beginning. They were stimulated by Jesus; they were not created nineteen hundred years ago. Possibly the world has not before been ready for the rule of Brotherhood; but that it is now I am sure. It is a rising tide and henceforward nothing can long resist its onward movement. . . .

Democracy is that form of government which secures to each individual his political rights. It presumes that those rights are the same for all men, but Brotherhood is a matter

of character, and has to do with the proper use of rights. Democracy may be consistent and still be the rule of a mob; but where Brotherhood prevails each man will seek the welfare of every other and mobs will be impossible. Democracy may be organized selfishness; Brotherhood is the spirit of universal good-will.

Socialism is an effort, often most commendable, to secure better social conditions by law; Brotherhood insists that until men love one another efforts to secure better conditions will be futile. Socialism administered by selfishness may be as tyrannical as the worst oppression by the "money power." Brotherhood will always be unselfish.

The conflict between labor and capital will never be settled until the employer sees in his employees his brothers; nor, on the other hand, until the laboring man sees in his employer a human being like himself, with complex problems to solve and bearing heavy burdens. The labor battle results from capitalists thinking of workmen as commodities rather than as men working; and from the workers regarding all who administer capital as tyrants. The solution of the problem is simple. When both classes love one another as brothers there will be no problem.

The same is true of international strife. Most wars are the result of national selfishness. What is called patriotism is often only selfishness in its larger relations. Patriotism, which is love of country for its ideals, for the virtue of its people, for its mountains and valleys, its rivers and lakes, is one of the holiest emotions which ever thrill a human heart; but "patriotism" which seeks to exalt one nation at the expense of another, or which is willing to sacrifice thousands of lives and break tens of thousands of hearts to avenge what is regarded as an aspersion on national honor, is beneath contempt. The remedy for war is Brotherhood. Brotherhood recognizes its kindred in all lands and among all

races; and is always willing to surrender its own interests that those of the larger number may be enhanced. . . .

It is always best to believe the best. In the absence of positive proof to the contrary, the best interpretation of life and history should always be accepted as the true one; and nothing better could be asked for man on this earth than the realization of Brotherhood. That will be the ideal social state. Yes, I am an optimist; and I believe that deep in your heart you are also one. Some time I hope not only to believe but to feel that every man is my brother. Then I shall be a better man; and when all men are possessed by that feeling this will be a better world.

—Amory H. Bradford, My Brother, Extracts from pp. 3-20.

## SERVICE FOR THE BROTHERHOOD

The great movement in which we are engaged is all part and parcel of a new way of life. It means that we must enter with fullness of appreciation into the activities and interests of peoples other than ourselves; that we must always and everywhere emulate the best they have to teach us and shun the worst; that we must answer in no uncertain tones that we are our brothers' keepers; and that, as with men so with nations, the path of justice, of integrity, and of fair dealing is the true path of honor. Let us see to it that we Americans tread steadily in it.

—Nicholas Murray Butler, The International Mind, p. 66. (Used by Permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.)

The questions: "What shall I do to be saved?" and "What shall I do to be of service?" may both be accounted as religious, but only the latter makes essentially and entirely for solidarity. The former question has at times found its solu-

tion in a life of solitude and withdrawal from sharing in the common lot.

—T. W. Rhys Davids, in Inter-Racial Problems, p. 63.

"What means the Voice of Life?" She answered, "Love"!
For love is life, and they who do not love
Are not alive. But every soul that loves
Lives in the heart of God and hears him speak."
—Henry van Dyke—Extract from poem "Vera."

The Bible at its highest, which means Jesus and His gospel, is for peace, because it teaches a religion grounded in the fatherly character of God, and because it teaches brotherhood as the supreme law of human society. The Bible has promoted peace, and will continue to promote peace through single individuals, who have been inspired by the beauty and the strength of its religion, as it has also promoted war, and may yet again promote war, through the influence of individuals who draw from the lowest levels of the Bible; but not until the leaders of the Church stand forth in their might —the might of conscience, the might of united endeavor, the might of their high calling—will the Bible have that master influence in realizing the vision of universal peace which of right belongs to it.

—George Holley Gilbert, The Bible and Universal Peace, p. 205.

Brotherhood has progressed among the nations with startling swiftness. Think of Moslems falling on the necks of Christians and kissing them and calling them brothers! Think of Jews fraternizing with Mohammedans! Think of the power which the common people are getting in all lands! Think of the progress of Socialism in England, Germany, and Russia! Socialism is a long way this side of Brotherhood, but it is a station on the road.

Think of the White Cross Society, the Red Cross Society, the Consumers' League, the Tuberculosis Congress, and The Hague Conference. Think of the men and women, good and true, who were fighting the battle of the children, of the poor, of the insane, and of the outcast, of those who are cleansing prisons and building hospitals! There are crime, disease, oppression, social enormities, but these are not multiplying. There are also love, service, brotherhood, and these are swiftly increasing. The crusade of Brotherhood is the most remarkable and prophetic of all the social movements of the modern world.

—Amory H. Bradford, My Brother, pp. 35, 36.

## CHAPTER II

## DANGERS IN MODERN NATIONALISM

Let us take thought in guarding our coasts, how we guard our ideals.

What folly it would be in us if, just at the moment when we had the opportunity to spread our ideal of justice and peace, we should abandon or deny our faith!

—David S. Muzzey.

### FALSE AND TRUE PATRIOTISM

The patriotism of most Americans to-day consists of a somewhat sentimental devotion to one's country, exemplified mostly in saluting the flag and singing national hymns, and in times of war a willingness to die for one's country. Even to-day, patriotism in most people's minds is associated with war. The patriot is one who has died on the field of battle. The monuments are mostly built to soldiers. Our patriotic hymns gather about war. Our two patriotic occasions are Independence Day and Memorial Day. Our histories and orations have, until quite recently, praised only the soldier as a patriot. We welcome under triumphal arches and with mighty acclamations those returning from the wars as our great children.

In reaction from this false and primitive patriotism it is not necessary to go to the extremes of Tolstoy or Hervé or Moscheles, although it is natural enough that these men should have come to dread the very word, seeing, as they have, how this perverted form of it has stood in the way of that growth of humanity as a whole which is greater than the

fancied welfare of any nation; and seeing as they have, how it has always emphasized a nation's rights instead of her duties (which principle, when applied to individuals, is considered unchristian by this same people). But inherently, there is no more reason why a proper love of one's country should interfere with a devotion to humanity any more than a love of one's home should proscribe one's devotion to his native land. Where all of these writers are probably right, however, is in their contention that most love of country is a manufactured, artificial thing. Even the old-fashioned patriotism did not spring spontaneously from childlike hearts, but was an expression of passions along avenues previously prepared for it.

The contention that most countries have never done enough for their people to elicit any natural affection is probably true in many instances. But where nations are striving to care for their people, as some are to-day, there is no reason why there should not be an affection for them, and likewise there is no reason why this affection should not assume such form as to be not only beautiful and commendable, but of genuine service to all humanity, just as a man's love for his home may be the most helpful asset of the community.

There are many signs that this "new patriotism" is rising upon the souls of men. It is running like a thread of light through much of our best literature and poetry. It is seen in the utterances of our greatest statesmen—those who feel the movements of this century and can sense their high direction. It appears in all this sudden international organization of churches, societies, and institutions, and in the innumerable world congresses being held. The remarkable spread of the peace movement in recent years is but a manifestation of it. The Hague Conferences are an outgrowth of it. The rising of the gospel of the brotherhood of man has gone on beside it. The cooperative instinct everywhere observed among the

laboring men of Europe, regardless of nationality, is a pronounced flowering of it. Instead of this false and primitive patriotism we find signs of a development of a patriotism "whose courage is of life, not death." It is a heroism of service and not of destruction. It is love of country which, while true to the highest in one's own nation, at the same time blesses every other. It is a national devotion which is stripped of all that selfishness that makes it exclusive and provincial. It is a patriotism in which all nations will rejoice with the nation which holds it.

—Frederick Lynch, What Makes a Nation Great, pp. 43-46.

The true grandeur of nations is in those qualities which constitute the greatness of the individual.

—Charles Sumner.

It behooves us at this critical moment to ask what patriotism is: what it is that we honor and love under the name of country and flag; what it is for which we are willing to risk our life and fortunes; what it is for which we must sacrifice our fair young manhood on the field of battle, and inflict upon the women who have borne them the still sharper pang of a lingering death in life in mourning for them? Waving the flag must not blind our eyes to the light of reason, nor hurrahs drown the voices of justice in our ears.

Patriotism literally means the doctrine of country, of fatherland, or *patria*. But actually the word is always used in the sense of philo-patriotism, or the love of the fatherland. What is it that we love as fatherland? Is it the approximate rectangle of earth bounded by the two oceans east and west and by the Canadian land on the north and the Mexican land and gulf on the south? Not quite so literally father-

*land* as that, you say. It is not the actual soil, with its rocks and rills, its woods and templed hills, that we love. Mountain for mountain, we do not love Mount Baker on the American side of the border any better than Mount Nelson on the Canadian side. The Rhine does not cease to be noble and become ignoble, or cease to be ignoble and become noble, when it leaves German territory and enters Dutch territory. It is not the particular area over which the American flag flies, I imagine, that men love. For our flag flies over the Philippines and Porto Rico.

Or is the feeling of patriotism rather a sense of political allegiance, the love of the American national state? The majesty of the state inspires awe. There is something that makes one thrill with pride in the mere sight of the great public buildings at Washington, the Capitol, the White House, the Library of Congress, the Treasury. A dignified ceremonial attends the movements of high official personages. The gravity of the Supreme Court is imposing. The eagle is emblazoned over the public portals, emblem of power, strength and swiftness, unconquerable, and majestic. All this is awe-inspiring. But is it what we love as patriots? We have but to remember that pomp and ceremony have been the accompaniments of despotism in all ages, and that it has been one of the favorite and craftiest occupations of the tyrant to deceive the people by this dumb show into thinking that they were receiving their due as citizens.

Ah, no, you say, it is not the awe and majesty of the state that we love as patriots, any more than the actual soil and views. It is rather an ideal of human association guaranteed and protected by all the power that there is in this land over which our flag waves, and over whose portals the eagle emblem is emblazoned—an ideal which informs and inspires all the majesty of state. The flag *per se* is a piece of colored cloth, the land *per se* is dirt, the public buildings are heaps

of stone, and the officials as men from the President down are "forked radishes" like you and me. It is an ideal of a democracy of justice, on which our nation was founded.

The menace of patriotism, as I see it, is this, that it shall lend its powerful name to sanction the battle for some lower ideal than this ideal of justice—for the extension of territory, of the increased power of the state, or the multiplication of engines of war, or even the defense of our coasts. The danger is that a conception of nationality shall prevail which is static, even retrograde, the very denial of the higher ideal of humanity. There is such an ideal of nationality fighting to-day with the might of the mightiest army the world has ever seen. There are apologists for this ideal of defiant nationality who, in cynical language, scout the idea of anything worth striving for beyond the national state, declaring that a man's "be-all and end-all" is to be a member of a triumphant nationality, and ridiculing the devotion to an ideal humanity beyond as moonshine. They talk of the mediation of their civilization to all the world, even if it has to be forced on the world at the point of the sword. This is nothing less than the purely arbitrary and gratuitous assumption that the present form of national state which humanity in its long development has reached is the end of that development, and that there is no hope of any expansion beyond. To announce such an ideal, and especially to announce it in the name of idealism, is to show the gravest misconception of the course of history and the greatest blindness to ethical principle. For it needs but the most superficial glance at history to see how through the ages the allegiance of men has ever been painfully won for ever higher and more inclusive units of political and social organization.

How can one be so blind to the evolution of history and so dull to the vision of ethical idealism as to say the process has stopped, and that the expansive power of brotherhood

and sympathy has found its limit in the national state? How dare one maintain that the same spirit of humanity that has broken down the enmity of family for neighboring family, of city-state for neighboring city-state, of feudal jurisdiction for neighboring feudal jurisdiction, must now stop and leave the state the eternal and implacable enemy of neighboring states? What right has anyone to say that the angel of peace shall not fly across a frontier without danger of being brought down by a sharp-shooter? What right has anyone to say that these nations must go on piling up against each other engines of destruction, and glowering at each other over borders bristling with cannon and fortresses, because, forsooth, they speak a different tongue, and have come from different origins?

Call this idealism if you please—I confess it. Call it a dream—every step in human progress has been a dream, a scouted, pitied, despised dream. We know the type of answer that men who call themselves hard-headed (but are rather steel-hearted) make to such a doctrine. We know the scorn with which they treat such ideas, as something like the vagaries of plausible pamphleteers who cannot make both ends meet. But still we say, Shame on the Bernhardis and men of their like, of every country, who call humanity a sapping, demoralizing, Utopian nightmare, and who add blasphemy to inhumanity by declaring that their cause of defiant nationality is the cause of God! . . .

The menace of our patriotism is that the ghost of Cæsar shall stalk before the Capitol at Washington and the banking houses of New York. We are not the inheritors of the Roman tradition in America. We are not aspirants for Empire. When our forefathers broke with Old World traditions and repudiated kings and aristocracies and priesthoods, basing the fabric of our government on the virtues and energies of the common man, with a sublime confidence in the uncommon

possibilities in his common clay, they substituted a patriotism of bold faith in the future for a patriotism of glorious memories of carnage in the past. . . .

Now the ideal of the American Republic is put to the test. We must hold it bravely in the face of the world. For what folly it would be in us if, just at the moment when we had the opportunity to spread our ideal of justice and peace, we should abandon or deny our faith! What an irreparable calamity for the cause of human progress if just at the moment when the nations were chastened by unparalleled misfortune to a point where they might listen to the entreaties for disarmament, our country should be found absorbed in the business of increasing its battalions, its fleets, and its guns! Let us take thought in guarding our coasts how we guard our ideals. . . .

Our danger from a foreign foe is hypothetical. The danger from our own infidelity to the ideals of justice and peace is imminent. . . .

I for one say: Better go down to defeat with the flag of American idealism flying, if invasion should come, than win under a banner besmirched with the blood of men sacrificed to the ambition of a defiant nationalism.

—David Saville Muzzey, The Menace of Patriotism, in The Standard, February, 1915, pp. 169-174.

The problem of the true relation between the ideals of Patriotism and Peace is one which cannot be avoided, and which urgently demands more careful and less prejudiced treatment than it has usually received. The civilized world stands now at the parting of the ways, where a right or wrong choice may be affected in no small degree by a wise or unwise handling of the great patriotic tradition.

If what sociologists call our "tribal conscience" is to grow naturally into the consciousness of the paramount supremacy

of the needs of civilized humanity as a whole, it is plain that some evolutionary change in the patriotic instinct is called for. . . .

But does it therefore follow that Patriotism is to be accounted the enemy of Peace? I cannot think so. I am perfectly convinced that nothing which the word Patriotism properly connotes need be regarded as an obstacle to progress, or as an element of hesitation in taking "the next step." . . .

Let no man think that he serves the cause of progress, or of peace, by trampling the great Ideal of Patriotism in the mud. The cause of international amity is the cause of Love freed from the limitations imposed by the earlier stages of the world's evolution. And as the flower of mankind has already solved the preliminary difficulty of conflicting affection in the case of Home and Country, with positive gain to both ideals, so may the greater problem find solution, when the full glory is realized of that larger life into which it is the destiny of the patriotic impulse to be translated and transfigured.—W. L. GRANE, The Passing of War, pp, 87, 96, 97. (The Macmillan Company, Publishers.)

We hesitate to employ a word so much abused as *patriotism,* whose true sense is almost the reverse of the popular sense. We have no sympathy with that boyish egotism, hoarse with cheering for one side, for one state, for one town; the right patriotism consists in the delight which springs from contributing our peculiar and legitimate advantages to the benefit of humanity. —EMERSON.

Patriotism will no longer relate to our particular patria—the United States, let us say, or the State of Ohio, or the city of Washington—and it will not be called patriotism, but something higher. Let us call it fellowship, if you please, brotherhood, humanism, enthusiasm of humanity, civilization, Christianity for it will be the fruition of that Christianity

taught by the Master. It will mark the final substitution of right reason for brute courage. Just as the latter lost its ferocity and was transfused into mental and moral qualities as the old individual antagonisms gave way, and finally found its chief field not in war but in the arts of peace, so the new patriotism will look upon the old glorification of war, the fierce delight in slaughter and destruction, as wild deliriums of fever, the ghastly and haggard nightmares of a night that is past.

To this hope, to this ideal, let us yield our admiration, our reverence, our obedience, our love. Toward it let us strive, though we may not attain. Sometime, somewhere, man will realize that for which we vainly yearn. Humanity will cast away its cruel and foolish burden of jealousy and antagonism, and with light heart and mutual encouragement climb the long spirals of progress which seem, indeed, ever to return upon themselves, but still rise forever skyward. Whether there is a goal of perfection we cannot say, but surely the spiral will rise to clear skies and a broad horizon, from which it will look back upon what we call civilization with the same wonder and repugnance with which we regard that geological period when "a monstrous eft was of old the lord and master of life."

—H. E. Warner, The Ethics of Force, pp. 63, 64.

The desire of an exclusive good for one's own nation is not of the essence of patriotism at all. And it is bad logic to describe sour milk and then argue from the description that therefore all milk is bad. I may love my own garden better than my neighbor's, and may even be specially pleased with certain plants which give it distinction, but I do not grudge my neighbor the precisely similar love and similar pleasure, as natural to him as to myself. But it would appear that I cannot genuinely love my garden unless I am always schem-

ing to prevent my flowers being grown by other people—which is absurd. But it is no less absurd to maintain that a peculiar love for one's own land involves ill-will to every other. There is no sort of necessity for such a consequence. The patriotic Englishman is no traitor to Wordsworthshire because he loves the Lakes and Mountains of Italy and Switzerland; nor do Rhine Castles and Thuringian Forests seem sinister because the castles are not at Warwick, or at Edinburgh, or even at Carnarvon, and because the German forests can produce no Stone of Rufus, no ghost of Robin Hood, no vivid memories of Shakespeare. The patriotic American can celebrate the Fourth of July, and boast Niagara and the Rockies, no less cordially for his pious pilgrimage to Stratford, his wonder in Westminster Abbey, and his joy in the antiquities of the Tower.

Now this extended appreciation, this modern cosmopolitan instinct, is typical of exactly what is called for in the sphere of personal and national relations. The widening sense of community of interest in all things human, which, partly in consequence of phenomenal facilities of intercourse, is characteristic of modern life, in no way interferes with particular affection and regard. It is certain that no man loves his home less for loving his country; then why should love of country be incompatible with love to all mankind? Concentration of particular affection, as the love of child and parent or of husband and wife, involves no hostility to those outside the family circle. And so it comes to pass, as Maurice truly taught, that "he is most just, on the whole, to every other nation, who has the strongest feeling of attachment to his own."—W. L. Grane, The Passing of War, pp. 94, 95.

(The Macmillan Company, Publishers.)

As yet we are but children and have the ways of children. Between the childish disputes, "It is," "It isn't," or "I want

to swing," "No, I won't let you swing," and the average difference between nations leading to war, there is in essence no distinction—nothing save the age and number of the disputants and the consequent variance in the objects which interest them. Relatively, the contest is unchanged, and equally it should be adjusted without killing and without the slow sapping away of life through taxation.

But if you tell me that such doctrines as I have tried to set out are opposed to patriotism, let me say to you that patriotism is not a fixed, but a growing term. When the first Englishmen planted themselves on the borders of Massachusetts Bay, their patriotism was bounded by the fringe of woods concealing Indian enemies. Later it meant a special sense of duty to those within the widening boundaries of the province. Yet a few years, and with the birth of a new nation, all who lived within the bounds of the thirteen original states were recognized as their brothers. Then, by leaps and bounds, it came to pass that the teeming millions of human beings from the Atlantic to the Pacific represented the solidarity of the country, and all were recognized as brothers under a common flag, and between such brothers war was a crime, and all troubles to be determined in a peaceful manner.

But one step is left. We have to recognize the brotherhood of the human race and the infinite crime of bloody contests between members of a common family. When the day of such recognition arrives we shall love our immediate neighbors no less, and for them reserve the special offices that our finite strength limits us to giving to the relatively few, while the narrower features of the patriotism of to-day will be swallowed up in a broad consideration for the rights of humanity, and all men will be brothers.

—Jackson H. Ralston, Some Supposed Just Causes of War, p. 10.

Not that I love country less, but Humanity more, do I now and here plead the cause of a higher and truer patriotism. I cannot forget that we are men by a more sacred bond than we are citizens—that we are children of a common Father more than we are Americans.

—Charles Sumner, Addresses on War, p. 71.

**INDIVIDUAL AND NATIONAL STANDARDS**

Alas! upon our own heads be the judgment of barbarism which we pronounce upon those that have gone before! At this moment, in this period of light, while to the contented souls of many the noonday sun of civilization seems to be standing still in the heavens, as upon Gibeon, the dealings between nations are still governed by the odious rules of brute violence which once predominated between individuals. The Dark Ages have not passed away; Erebus and black Night, born of Chaos, still brood over the earth; nor can we hail the clear day, until the hearts of nations are touched, as the hearts of individual men, and all acknowledge *one and the same Law of Right.*

What has taught you, O man! thus to find glory in an act, performed by a nation, which you condemn as a crime or a barbarism, when committed by an individual? In what vain conceit of wisdom and virtue do you find this incongruous morality? Where is it declared that God, who is no respecter of persons, is a respecter of multitudes? Whence do you draw these partial laws of an impartial God? Man is immortal; but Nations are mortal. Man has a higher destiny than Nations. Can Nations be less amenable to the supreme moral law? Each individual is an atom of the mass. Must not the mass, in its conscience, be like the individuals of which it is composed? Shall the mass, in relations with other masses, do what individuals in relations with each other may not do? As in the physical creation, so in the moral, there is

but one rule for the individual and the mass. It was the lofty discovery of Newton, that the simple law which determines the fall of an apple prevails everywhere throughout the universe—ruling each particle in reference to every other particle, large or small—reaching from earth to heaven, and controlling the infinite motions of the spheres. So, with equal scope, another simple law, *the Law of Right,* which binds the individual, binds also two or three when gathered together—binds conventions and congregations of men—binds villages, towns, and cities—binds states, nations, and races—clasps the whole human family in its sevenfold embrace; nay, more, it binds the angels of Heaven, Cherubim, full of knowledge, Seraphim, full of love; above all, it binds, in self-imposed bonds, a just and omnipotent God.

—Charles Sumner, Addresses on War, pp. 45, 46.

If patriotism is a duty—and under my conception of it I hold it to be so—it must somehow be brought within the system of ethics. Its basis must not be sought in a sentiment, but in laws of right and wrong. It is not an isolated virtue, but a part of character. It is not a theory, but a question of conduct. "Love of country" cannot be satisfied by a froth of enthusiasm, the clapping of hands, the blubbering of vulgar sentimentality, nor even by enlistment in the army. "Devotion to its interests" will not be evidenced by the blind applause of every proposed action by the government, right or wrong, wise or foolish. It will be shown rather by the patient effort to determine, first of all, what is the rational and proper action. If, unfortunately, a different one has been determined upon, it will endeavor, so far as possible, to make the error manifest and to urge another course. When the true one has been found, then it will be manifest by a willingness to make sacrifices and bear hardships, if need be, to accomplish the end sought. It will there-

fore involve the exercise of the soundest judgment and the coolest reason.

—H. E. WARNER, The Ethics of Force, pp. 42, 43.

The one distinctive advance in civil society achieved by the Anglo-Saxon world is fairly betokened by the passing away of this old notion of a peculiar possession in the way of honor which had to be guarded by arms. It stands out as the one clear moral gain of the nineteenth century. And, when we observe the notion resurging in the minds of men, we may reasonably expect to find that it marks one of those reversions in the on-going of moral development which so often occur in the realm of mind as well as in that of organic forms.

The second respect in which national vanity strikes a lower note than personal, is not less suggestive. The crude rivalry of material possession which is one of the ear-marks of patriotism, has no counterpart among civilized adult individuals. The average man has not a fit of spleen upon hearing that another has had an accession of fortune. He likes to get what he can for himself, but it is not gall and wormwood to him if some one else gets more. Still less do individuals boast of their wealth, their acreage. . . . It has been well said that, if for this reason alone, the men of the lesser states, basing their national credit upon better things than bigness of acreage, tend to become ethically our superiors.

The analogy between personal and national conduct needs, however, some qualification. It may be asked, Are we to have no pride of race, to find no joy in national achievement, to indulge no thrill of great tasks accomplished?

A reference to the rule universally accepted as just, if not universally adhered to between civilized men and women in their personal relations, at once indicates the answer to the question. The crass pride of material possession, the

boast of acres and wealth, the subordination of morality and all regard for others, to their acquisition, the display of power over others, crude brag of superiority to the rest of the world, and the general shaping of conduct on the assumption that where the ideas of others differ from our own they must be false ideas—such behavior the world over is a sure indication of moral shortcoming. Yet some such attitude, it must be acknowledged, is indistinguishable from nine tenths of current patriotism. In the individual it is not merely obnoxious from the point of view of feeling, but necessarily implies a defect of character which, if widespread in the community, must involve social decay. It is in the true sense, that pride which goeth before a fall. Vanity of this character is disastrous in its final material outcome. It represents the social type which is characteristic of decadent groups: it was characteristic of later Roman society as it is to-day of much Oriental.

Yet in the social sphere it is easy to distinguish the point at which mere vanity becomes self-respect: the point at which pride of wealth and power is subordinated, not necessarily abandoned, to pride of character. Such pride becomes a motive as fruitful of beneficent progress as the other is of decay. The material progress of civilization is marked by the improvement of the personal ideal in this respect. In its final form the proposition becomes a mere truism: Society is corrupt to the degree to which character is overlooked, and the acquisition of wealth and power by any means whatsoever considered justifiable. It is as evident that national conduct must suffer to a corresponding degree if the patriotic ideal be one which overlooks the morality of all acts so long as they make for national aggrandizement.

It will be argued that in the very nature of the case personal and national intercourse do not stand upon the same plane, that any attempt to establish an absolute analogy

between them must break down; that nations are trustees not entitled to allow nice considerations to weigh in the consideration of their wards' interests.

The answer to this does but reenforce my general conclusion, that from the purely utilitarian point of view, vanity as a national motive is condemned even more severely than as a personal one.

—Norman Angell, Patriotism Under Three Flags, pp. 48-50. (G. P. Putnam's Sons, Publishers.)

Just as national relations are less controlled by rationalism than are individuals, so is national vanity of a distinctly lower order than the vanity which obtains between civilized individuals. This is shown prominently in two ways: by the survival among nations of the morality of the duel, with its archaic notions of an arm-defended honor, notions long since abandoned between at least English-speaking individuals; and the distinctly cruder type of that barbaric boastfulness which vaunts mainly bigness of territory and greatness of wealth—a type of vanity which in this crude form has quite disappeared in the intercourse of all civilized individuals—Saxon, Celt, or Latin.

The survival, where national prestige is concerned, of the standards of the *code duello* is daily brought before us by the rhetoric of the patriots. Our army and our navy, not the good faith of our statesmen, are the "guardians of our national honor." Like the duellist, the patriot would have us believe that a dishonorable act is made honorable if the party suffering by the dishonor be killed. The patriot is careful to withdraw from the operation of possible arbitration all questions which could affect the "national honor." An "insult to the flag" must be "wiped out in blood." Small nations, which in the nature of the case cannot so resent the insults of great empires, have apparently no right to such a possession

as "honor." It is the peculiar prerogative of world-wide empires. The patriots who would thus resent "insults to the flag" may well be asked how they would condemn the conduct of the German lieutenant who kills the unarmed civilian in cold blood, "for the honor of the uniform."

It does not seem to have struck the patriot that as personal dignity and conduct has not suffered, but been improved by the abandonment of the principle of the duel, there is little reason to suppose that international conduct, or national dignity, would suffer by a similar change of standards.

The whole philosophy underlying the duel where personal relations are concerned, excites in our day the infinite derision of all Anglo-Saxons. Yet these same Anglo-Saxons maintain it as vigorously as ever in the relations of states.

It may be worth while in passing, as an answer to those who still regard as chimerical any hope that rationalism will ever dominate the conduct of nations in these matters, to point out how rapidly the duel has disappeared from the personal relations of our society. But two generations since this progress toward a national standard of conduct would have seemed as unreasonable as do the hopes of international peace in our day.

—Norman Angell, Patriotism Under Three Flags, pp. 45, 46. (G. P. Putnam's Sons, Publishers.)

It is a puzzling fact that international conduct is so often judged by far lower standards than are the acts of individuals. We have here a strange doubling of the criterion of honor, analogous to that double standard of truth, which was defended in mediæval schools. Violence, lying, and bribery, that occur only among individuals without the pale, are found among the established means of intercourse with honored nations. Men who would not think of assaulting another to gain an end—who would indeed suffer great loss,

and be proud to suffer it, rather than obtain their rights by such a method—feel that a nation should be ever ready to assert its claims by blows. A peace that would be the height of honor with an individual is, when presented in national form, at once proclaimed shameful and unrighteous.

—George M. Stratton, The Double Standard, in Regard to Fighting, p. 3, in Documents of The American Association for International Conciliation, 1912.

There is need just now that Christians in America should do all that in them lies to see that this country stands before the world committed to the Servant-ideal, rather than to the King-ideal, to meekness rather than to might. In his last message to Congress the President spoke words which glowed with the spirit we should feel and show. We may differ as to his policies, we may disagree as to the need of inquiry into the efficiency of our military and naval defenses; good citizens and true Christians do differ as to these matters. But on the supreme issue we must be one with him, in holding that, above all, America must just now manifest moral might, must proclaim and defend her ideals of friendship and peace, and must jealously hold aloof from anything, however innocent, which might jeopardize her reputation for friendliness and confidence toward other nations, and her desire to act as peacemaker when the time comes. Those are right who insist that, if we are to have an army and navy, these departments of government should be kept efficient and strong, as all departments of government should be. But the supreme need just now, to which all other desires and aims must yield, is that the national spirit and conscience should be set and kept in order for the great task of peace making in which America will have the opportunity to play a great part.

—William Pierson Merrill, Might or Meekness, pp. 13, 14.

## NATIONAL DANGERS AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. Cortelyou has called our attention to the fact that while in thirty years we have increased our population by 85 per cent, and our wealth by 185 per cent, we have increased our national expenses by 400 per cent.

It is within those thirty years that we have spent one billion dollars on our navy. And the end is not yet. The Secretary of the Navy has recently asked for twenty-seven additional vessels for the coming year, four of which are battleships at ten million dollars each, and he is frank to say that these twenty-seven are only a fraction of the vessels to be asked for later on. We have already, built or building, thirty-one first-class battleships, our navy ranking next to Great Britain, Germany standing third, France fourth, and Japan fifth; but never has the naval lobby at Washington been so voracious and so frantic for additional safeguards of the peace as to-day.

The militarists are peace-at-any-price men. They are determined to have peace even at the risk of national bankruptcy. Everything good in Germany, Italy, Austria, England, and Prussia is held back by the confiscation of the proceeds of industry carried on for the support of the army and navy. In the United States the development of our resources is checked by this same fatal policy. We have millions of acres of desert land to be irrigated, millions of acres of swamp land to be drained, thousands of miles of inland waterways to be improved, harbors to be deepened, canals to be dug, and forests to be safeguarded and yet for all these works of cardinal importance we can afford only a pittance. We have not sufficient money to pay decent salaries to our United States judges, or to the men who represent us abroad. We have pests, implacable and terrible, like the gypsy moth, and plagues like tuberculosis, for whose extermination millions of money are needed at once.

On every hand we are hampered and handicapped because

we are spending two thirds of our enormous revenues on pensions for past wars, and on equipment for wars yet to come. The militarists begrudge every dollar that does not go into army or navy. They believe that all works of internal improvement ought to be paid for by the selling of bonds, even the purchase of sites for new post offices being made possible by mortgaging the future. They never weary of talking of our enormous national wealth, and laugh at the niggardly mortals who do not believe in investing in guns. Why should we not spend as great a proportion of our wealth on military equipment as the other nations of the world? This is their question, and the merchants and farmers will answer it some day.

This delusion threatens to become as mischievous as it is expensive. Every increase in the American navy strengthens the militarists in London, Berlin, and Tokyo. The difficulty of finding a reason for an American navy increases the mischief. Why should the United States have a colossal navy? No one outside of the militarists can answer. Because there is no ascertainable reason for this un-American policy, the other American countries are becoming frightened. Brazil has just laid down an extravagant naval program, for the proud Republic of the South cannot consent to lie at the mercy of the haughty Republic of the North. The new departure of Brazil has bewitched Argentina from the vision which came to her before the statue of Christ, which she erected high up amid the Andes, and has fired her with a desire to rival in her battleships her ambitious military neighbor. We first of all have established militarism in the Western world, and are by our example dragging weaker nations into foolish and suicidal courses, checking indefinitely the development of two continents.

Our influence goes still further. It sets Australia blazing, and shoves Japan into policies which she cannot afford. But

we cannot harm foreign nations without working lasting injury on ourselves. The very battleships which recently kindled the enthusiasm of children in South America, Australia, and Japan, also stirred the hearts of American boys and girls along our Atlantic and Pacific seaboards, strengthening in them impulses and ideals of an Old World which struggled and suffered before Jesus came. It is children who receive the deepest impressions from pageants and celebrations, and who can measure the damage wrought upon the world by the parade of American battleships? Children cannot look upon symbols of brute force, extolled and exalted by their elders, without getting the impression that a nation's power is measured by the caliber of its guns, and that its influence is determined by the explosive force of its shells. A fleet of battleships gives a wrong impression of what America is, and conceals the secret which has made America great. Children do not know that we became a great world-power without the assistance of either army or navy, building ourselves up on everlasting principles by means of our schools and our churches. The down-pulling force of our naval pageant was not needed in the world already dragged down to low levels by the example of ancient nations, entangled by degrading traditions from which they are struggling to escape. The notion that this exhibition of battleships has added to our prestige among men whose opinion is worthy of consideration, or has made the world love us better, is only another feature of the militarist delusion.

—Charles E. Jefferson, The Delusion of Militarism, pp. 13-15, in the Documents of The American Association for International Conciliation, 1909.

Since our republic was founded, it has never been attacked. We ourselves began all our three foreign wars: the War of

1812, which would probably not have occurred if we had had an Atlantic cable and known of England's concession in withdrawing the Orders in Council which were the main cause of the war; the Mexican War, which was primarily fought in the interests of the slave power and, in the words of Hon. John W. Foster, was a war of "conquest and injustice"; the Spanish War, which would probably not have opened, in the opinion of our then minister to Spain, General Woodford, had Congress waited forty-eight hours. In all these three foreign wars combined, including the Philippine adjunct to our Spanish War, we lost *less than fifteen thousand men by foreign bullets.*

It was once our pride and glory that we need not burden ourselves with the millstone of militarism that the great powers of Europe have hung around their necks. To-day, with our new militarism and big-navy craze and under the clamor of certain vested interests which want contracts for military equipments, we are following Old World methods and follies without the Old World's excuse. A spirit of vain emulation has been goading us to economic madness. Though we are comparatively rich, we can ill afford the gigantic price we are paying for this either real or assumed new timidity and this humiliating scare which our huge navy implies. Since Washington's time, our population has increased about twenty-three times and our area perhaps three times; we have increased our naval expenses alone over one hundred and twenty times! Our armaments have increased five times as fast as our population. . . .

It is within the limits of possibility that Canada will burn Detroit, that our troops will sack Quebec, that New York will be wiped out by a tidal wave and an earthquake; a million things may be possible, not one of which is in the least probable. Galveston was wiped out by a tidal wave, but shall we therefore spend one hundred million dollars in

putting a high wall of reenforced cement around Manhattan? No sane, strong people like ourselves can be pardoned if we focus attention on mere possibilities of danger, when definite, certain evils daily threaten us within our midst, against which we are grossly unprepared.

—Lucia Ames Mead, Swords and Ploughshares, pp. 25, 27, 46-47.

**MILITARISM**

As illustrating the effort to develop the naval and military spirit, it is not strange that the chief of staff of the American army has affirmed that we are wasting time in seeking arbitrations, and that the only true course for us to pursue is to make our military and naval strength so great as to be beyond danger of attack. Nor is it strange that the gallant admiral who started in command of our fleet on its tour around the world is reported to have said that the fewer statesmen and the more ironclads there were, the less would be the danger of war. In other words, if we had more guns and fewer people unwilling to use them there would be less shooting. Such logic as that, as Mark Twain would say, is simply unanswerable. It might as well be said that to stop personal quarrels and prevent shooting, the law should require every man to carry a loaded pistol in his hip pocket.

—Justice Brewer, The Mission of the United States in the Cause of Peace.

Survey an army prepared for battle. See the cannons, muskets, mortars, swords, drums, trumpets, and flags. Do these men look like Christians? Do they talk like followers of the meek and lowly Son of God? Are they prepared to act like the friends of the human race, and like followers of God, as dear children, seeking to bring all men to the knowledge of him?

The whole structure of an army is in violation of New Testament precepts. What absolute despotism! What division of rank by nice gradations! "Condescending to men of low estate" would spoil discipline. "Esteeming others better than themselves" would degrade the officers. Instead of humanity, must be gay trappings. Instead of Christ's law of love, must be man's rule of honor.

—Howard Malcolm, The Absurdities of Militarism, p. 2 Publications of the American Peace Society.

Let me state what, in my judgment, is the fundamental cause. The war is the result of a false philosophy of national life, a philosophy which maintains that the foundation of all power is physical force, and that greatness is to be computed in terms of brute strength. It is a barbaric philosophy which has been driven from one field to another because of the havoc it wrought, and we now see its operations in a realm in which it is working its ruin on a scale vast and appalling. Out of this philosophy there develops a policy—the policy of armed peace, the policy which bases peace on the fear which is inspired by deadly weapons. The policy was long tried in the realm of individual life. Men went daily armed to the teeth to protect themselves against one another. The practice led to interminable brawls, and feuds, and duels, until at last it was given up. Only rowdies now carry knives and guns. The policy was then adopted by cities. Cities preserved the peace by arming themselves. Every city had its wall, its moat, its drawbridges. Its armed forces were always held in leash ready for either defense or attack. The history of those days is a disgusting record of deadly rivalries, rapine and slaughter. The policy was at last banished from the realm of interurban life. Cities situated within narrow limits bound themselves together into leagues, and numerous small states took their place on the European map. These provinces adopted, how-

ever, the policy of armed peace, and the result was constant jealousies and bickerings and frequent bloody collisions. The little states grew sick at last of the exhausting strife and rolled themselves into great states which became known as world powers. But the old policy of armed peace which the common sense of men had banished from the realm of individual, and interurban, and interprovincial life, was retained in the realm of international life. Men knew that little states could not wisely adopt it, but they supposed that large states could. They banished it from the administration of little powers, and retained it in the scheme of the great powers. The result is a great war.

Militarism is the absolute negation of Christianity. The one exhibits a mailed fist, the other shows you a hand that is pierced. The one carries a big stick, the other carries the cross on which the Prince of Glory died. The one declares that might makes right, the other affirms that right makes might. The one says that the foundation of all things is force, the other says that the foundation of all things is love. Militarism is materialism in its deadliest manifestation. It is atheism in its most brutal and blatant incarnation. It is the enemy of God and man. It must be overthrown. Every nation which becomes its devotee is doomed. Militaristic nations are broken to pieces like potters' vessels. So did the Almighty break Nineveh and Babylon, Persia, and Greece, and Rome, and so unless they repent will he break in fragments the so-called great powers of Europe. He will, if necessary, convert the capitals of our modern world into dust heaps like those of Thebes and Memphis, and begin the world anew. He will overturn and overturn, until he whose right it is, shall reign. He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit is saying to the churches—and to the nations!

—Rev. Charles E. Jefferson, The Causes of the War, pp. 44, 45.

Discussions of national defense by "chiefs of staff" are usually unedifying and almost always superfluous. They are superfluous because we always know in advance what these gentlemen will say. They are the last people in the world for reasonable republics to listen to for advice about the size of their armies and navies. Men might as well ask their tailor whether they should have a new coat or their architect for his opinion whether a bigger and costlier house is in order. Since time began there was no head of a country's military establishment who did not call for more soldiers and military machinery. The German army to-day is not big enough to suit "the staff," and the British navy is not big enough to suit the Admiralty. Our own army is not big enough to suit General Leonard Wood, its chief of staff. We could mobilize only 105,000 men; and for the war which we shall "probably have in the not distant future" we must have 600,000. Therefore, young college men especially should get busy, so that when the war comes they can be the officers.

This was actually preached by General Leonard Wood at the Harvard Union to an audience, we read, of five hundred students. It was certainly not so bad as his last public preachment. That was at Saint Louis, where he went into his glowing panegyric upon the universal military service in Germany, and wished that we might out-German Germany in this sort of thing. Many serious men cannot fail to ask themselves as they read the report whether it is not perilously close to an impropriety for "chiefs of staff" and other such executive agents in the government's military service to take the platform for discussions of public policy involving military issues. The peril lies in the fact that while these gentlemen are supposedly experts on questions of how to fight, they are as such the last persons in the world to go to for counsel as to whether to fight or to get into the fighting attitude; while the uncritical and superficial crowd is constantly apt

to think them experts in the larger question, which is a question of statesmanship. The most foolish thing ever said by Fighting Bob Evans was, at a time when Congress was discussing the naval appropriations, that what the country needed was "fewer statesmen and more battleships." His slur was upon the statesmen; but he is to be thanked at least for pointing a good antithesis and reminding us that the two stand in opposition, and that the more we have of one the less we shall have of the other. The question for this republic is at the moment which kind of ship—battleship or statesmanship—it means to make its ship of state.

The worst part of General Leonard Wood's plea before the Harvard students for bigger armaments was the ground upon which he based it. "We are the only nation which stands for definite policies which are almost certain to bring us into conflict with other nations which are expanding. The Monroe Doctrine and our policy of not allowing even commercial coaling stations of other powers in American waters are practically sure to cramp foreign nations at some time," and force us into war with them; hence, let us have betimes 600,000 soldiers. Hence, the rational man would surely say, overhaul these exceptional and offensive policies of ours, and see if they stand the test of reason and of the world's growing interdependence and cooperation, or whether they belong to the selfish survivals of international policies which we ought long ago to have outgrown. "If you are prepared for war," says the chief of staff, "you will find that the best guard against war." The best guard against war is the policy which does not invite war, which does not foolishly and groundlessly offend other nations, but makes them our friends and assures them that we are their friends. "Turkey is being defeated," he says, "principally because of her lack of preparation." Would he be glad to see her so well "prepared" that she could crush the Balkan states in their struggle for their rights?

Turkey is being defeated, not because she ought to have more soldiers, but because she misgoverned her provinces of Macedonia and Albania, and these in the crisis became inevitably and properly her enemies and not her friends, a source of weakness and doom instead of defense and strength. This is the thing for the inheritors and spokesmen of the world's outgrown military *régime* to remember in this modern world; and the business of generals and admirals and the rest of us —and it would be easy and grateful to name some of the generals and admirals who are as conspicuous as anybody else in declaring it—is to devote ourselves not to the organization of bigger armies and navies, but to the organization of the international justice which will make these gradually unnecessary.

"When a nation becomes large and rich and inert," the chieftain continues, "it is certain of annihilation by other powers"; and the intimation is that we are inert because we do not raise our force of regulars from 105,000 to 600,000, build up a great reserve force, and turn our colleges into schools for compulsory military drill. The whole argument is an argument that our Canadian brothers on the north, who devote their energies to industry and useful pursuits, are inert, and that our Venezuelan brethren at the south, who so chronically maintain what Colonel Roosevelt calls the "fighting edge," are the more alert for true progress, a strong national life, and the uplift of the world. . . .

"Our commercial growth," says the chief of staff, "must be accompanied by military growth." The answer to this mischievous and foolish dictum was effectually given in Boston by the International Congress of Chambers of Commerce, when unanimously and with the greatest enthusiasm manifested during its memorable session it declared that the world's commercial growth must be accompanied by the banishment of militarism, which, with its enormous burdens,

is the chief menace to the industry and trade of the modern interdependent family of nations, and that the commercial leaders of the world must work together to put an end to the atrocities of war and organize the nations for the settlement of their differences by international arbitration and international courts. I think that this greatest commercial organization of the world, thus declaring itself in the most important and representative commercial congress ever held, would impatiently brook the tuition in the conditions of commercial growth now proffered it by our American "chief of staff."

General Wood could not have brought his anachronistic preachment to a worse place than Harvard University. "I am sorry," he said, "that there is no military instruction here at Harvard College"; and he held up for emulation to the young men gathered in the Harvard Union the "many colleges which have compulsory military drill," and are thus fitting themselves for leadership in the supposedly inevitable war to which our offensive policies are calculated to bring us with the foreign nations "cramped" by them! It is the glory of Harvard University that it has contributed more leaders than any other higher institution of learning, not only in America, but in the world, to the commanding movement to put a period to "inevitable wars" and to supplant the war system by the system of international law and reason. It was a great Harvard scholar, Charles Sumner, who said that the greatest service which the Springfield arsenal ever rendered this country was in inspiring the lofty verse of Longfellow, a great Harvard professor, upon the impeachment of our civilization presented by the fact that, two millenniums after Christ, we still maintain such arsenals for the storage and manufacture of our chief tools for settling international disputes. To Harvard University, when he died, Charles Sumner left provision for an annual prize for the best dis-

sertation by any Harvard student on the methods by which war can be permanently superseded, the first provision of its kind in human history. William Ladd, Channing, Emerson, Parker, Lowell, Phillips Brooks, Edward Everett Hale, Joseph Choate and a score of other great names illustrate Harvard's preeminent service in the true method of settling international differences.

—Edwin D. Mead.

Merely to avow one's belief in Christianity is an uncertain thing. Constantine did this and bound together the Cross and the sword. Centuries followed his example with accumulating disaster and scandal. Now to wrench the Cross from the sword is a difficult task. But it must be done. The Church must clear herself, however costly it may be. Christ and the Antichrist must separate. The temptation of the wilderness is not over. The siege is long. Faith still looks for triumph, because of her resting on the arm of Christ, who cannot "fail nor be discouraged." Lines of thought that lead to force must be abandoned. As said the late Pope: "We must think peace." Against the long lines of thoughts of war, to think peace is a costly revolution, upsetting many sacred traditions and setting us to the rewording of our prayers. Only in thinking peace after the thought of Christ will we be able to find in Him the Prince of Peace.

—Peter Ainslie, The Scourge of Militarism, p. 9.

## NATIONAL NEIGHBORLINESS

In any given decade the movement toward neighborliness may seem stationary, but substitute the perspective of a century for the narrow view of ten years, and the forward stride takes on gigantic proportions. In these globe-measurements the daily newspaper hinders rather than helps, because

it is surrendered to this morning's news, and the meaning of that news must often be sought twenty years back. The historian is often more up-to-date than the news editor; at this moment the real question in Mexico is not what this man or that man is doing, but what are the vital conditions of the country developed during the last fifty years.

The significant fact in the history of the last century has been the widening of the neighborhood and the spread of the neighborly spirit; in view of the bearing of this aspect of progress on advance in other fields, and as an evidence not only of more civilization, but of a higher quality of civilization, it may appear a little later that it was the most significant fact in the history of the last century. The neighborhood long ago ceased to be a matter of physical proximity; a score of scientific agents, methods, and instruments have made it a matter, not of space, but of time, feeling, imagination. The other day the East Indian was so remote from our knowledge, so strange to our thought, so alien to our intellectual world, that he was like a man from Mars; to-day he receives the Nobel prize for literature, and his poetry moves us because it is so deeply and beautifully human. The other day we were "foreign devils" in China; to-day the prime minister of that far-away country with his own hands lays the corner stone of the new Y. M. C. A. building in Peking. The other day the gates of Japan had been bolted against the world for two hundred and seventy years; to-day, when an irritating international situation was created by the action of a State legislature, a man of great personal dignity, now Premier, called a conference of representative Japanese and Americans at his house, and in a few but impressive words told them that such difficulties could be settled neither by law nor by diplomacy; that religion alone could remove the causes of such differences and solve the problems created by them. It was a striking appeal for neighborliness in a country which, within the

memory of the man who made it, imposed the death penalty on all its subjects who visited or had any relations with the rest of the world.

This ultimate coming together of the various families of men was predicted in the far beginnings of history. For men were born with the capacity of understanding one another because they were born with organs of observation and of thought, with emotion and will; at any given moment the variations of development may be so great as almost to constitute differences of kind; but, as Dr. Nitobe has said, these differences are in the institutional, not in the human mind. The travelers have come by divergent paths, but they look with eyes and hear with ears made in the same fashion. And when they reach a certain stage of development they emerge into a world which they hold in common. A famous Buddhist abbot defined the fundamental idea of Buddhism as the endeavor to disperse the clouds of ignorance by the clear shining of enlightenment. "By spiritual enlightenment," he said, "I mean a man's becoming conscious through personal experience of the ultimate nature of his inner being. This insight breaks, as it were, the wall of intellectual limitation and brings us to a region which has been hitherto concealed from our view." "All things in the world come from one root," wrote a Japanese teacher to a student, "and so all men in the four seas who are, so to speak, its branches, must be brethren one of another." Neither the four seas nor the seven seas can permanently separate them.

—Hamilton W. Mabie, Ethics and the Larger Neighborhood, pp. 26-29. (University of Penn., Publishers.)

The term *neighbor* embraces every man regardless of racial barriers. The meaning of the parable of the Good Samaritan is this: Brotherhood is not confined to those of the same race *or* to those of the same religion. It embraces *all* men. You

have a duty as neighbor to every one who needs your help and whom you can help.

—William E. Wilson, Christ and War, p. 48.

## BROTHERHOOD—GOOD SAMARITAN

The church, more than commerce, binds the nations together. The Christian church is the best ally, as it was the precursor, of democracy. The university is definitely expressed in the name assumed or in the creed recited. The church is not the English, or American, or Greek, or Roman church. It is the Holy Catholic Church. The first word of the creed expresses belief in God the Father Almighty, whose children therefore all men are. The Fatherhood of God implies the brotherhood of men. Spontaneously from the beginning Christians call one another brethren. Beside this principle of universal brotherhood differences of Protestant and Catholic polity diminish into insignificance. The one may exalt the organization above the individual, giving the society authority over the person. The other may subordinate the organization to the individual, exalting private judgment. The one may regard salvation as flowing to the person only through the church, according to the maxim: *Ubi Ecclesia ibi Spiritus.* The other may regard the church as the result of personal faith, as the company of believers, according to the maxim: *Ubi Spiritus, ibi Ecclesia.* The one may lean too heavily on the organization. The other may encourage excessive individualism. Each may need to be corrected by the other. But in either case, the church is the society of universal brotherhood, the institute of humanity.

The church is under the law of service according to the needs of men on the one hand and ability on the other hand. To the question, Who is my neighbor? the answer is given not by locality, nor by affinity of class, nation, or culture, but by

sympathy. A neighbor is one, wherever he is, and whoever he is, who needs what I can give, or can give what I need. The church enlists strength in the service of weakness, wisdom in the service of ignorance, fortune in the service of misfortune, the saved in search of the lost. The state stands chiefly for the protection of rights on the basis of justice. The church stands for the discharge of duties on the basis of love.

—George Harris, Moral Evolution, pp. 377, 378.

During the last quarter of a century we have caught a glimpse of a new national honor. It is the belief that battle and bloodshed, except for the immediate defense of hearth and home, is a blot on the 'scutcheon of any nation. It is the creed of modern men who rise in their majesty and say: "We will not stain our country's honor with the bloodshed of war. God-given life is too dear. The forces of vice, evil, and disease are challenging us to marshal our strength and give them battle. There is too much good waiting to be done, too much suffering waiting to be appeased, for us to waste the life-blood of our fathers and sons on the field of useless battle. Here do we stand. We believe we are right. With faith in our belief we throw ourselves upon the altar of truth. Let heaven-born justice decide." Here is honor unsmirched, untainted! Here is pride unhumbled! Here is patriotism that is all-embracing, that makes us so zealous for real honor that we turn from the horrors of war to combat the evils that lie at our very doors.

Jesus taught the people that all men are children of one Father, and that therefore the whole law of God is to love God and one's neighbor.

And one lawgiver, knowing this, and wishing to catch Jesus in His words, and to show Him that all men are not equal, and that men of different nations cannot be equally the sons

of God, asked Jesus: "You teach us to love our neighbor. But who is my neighbor?" Jesus answered him by a parable, and said: "There was a rich Jew; and it happened that once, as he was returning home, he was attacked by robbers, who beat him, robbed him, and left him by the roadside. A Jewish priest passed by, and saw the wounded man, but passed on without stopping. And another Jew, a Levite, passed and he also saw the wounded man, and went by. Then a man of another nation, a Samaritan, came along the road, and he saw the wounded man: and—without considering that the Jews did not look upon Samaritans as neighbors, but as foreigners and enemies—he pitied the Jew, lifted him up, and took him on his ass to an inn. There he washed and dressed his wounds, paid the innkeeper for him, and only left when the Jew could do without him.

"You ask, Who is one's neighbor?" said Jesus. "He in whom there is love considers every man his neighbor, no matter what nation he may belong to." (Luke 10: 25-37.)

—Leo Tolstoi, The Teachings of Jesus.

## CHAPTER III

## THE CHARACTER AND CAUSES OF WAR

War is the trade of barbarians.

—NAPOLEON.

War is a most detestable thing. If you had seen but one day of war you would pray God you might never see another.

—WELLINGTON.

### WHAT IS WAR? (Defined)

A properly conducted contest of armed public forces. (See International Law. Wilson and Tucker.)

War is not the mere employment of forces but the existence of the legal condition of things in which rights are, or may be, prosecuted by force.

Thus, if two nations declare war one against the other, war exists, though no force whatever may as yet have been employed. On the other hand, force may be employed by one nation against another, as in the case of reprisals, and yet no state of war may arise. In such a case there may be said to be an act of war, but no state of war. The distinction is of the first importance, since, from the moment when a state of war supervenes third parties become subject to the performance of the duties of neutrality as well as to all the inconveniences that result from the exercise of belligerent rights. One of the most remarkable illustrations of the distinction here pointed out was the condition of things in China

in 1900, when the armed forces of the allies marched to Peking and occupied parts of the country without any resultant state of war.

Cicero says that war is a contest or contention carried on by forces. But usage applies the term not only to the action (a contest) but to the state or condition, and thus we may say, war is the state of persons contending by force as such.

—International Law Digest—Moore.

**WHAT IS WAR? (Described Rather Than Defined)**

War is cruelty.
War is hell.
War is a game.
War is a disturbance and derangement of the moral and social order.
War is an evil that can be avoided.
War not an unmistakable evil.
War a concentration of all human crimes.
War is the greatest curse.
War—a good thing (?)
War the common enemy.
War an awful misfortune even for the victor.
War is essential (?).
War the father of other wars.
War not established by God.

**WHAT IS PEACE?**

Public tranquillity and obedience to law.
Freedom from international hostilities.
(Webster's Dictionary.)
Peace is the normal relation of states.
(International Law—Wilson and Tucker.)

War is a profound disturbance and derangement of the social and moral order.

The fact that there are still learned people who think war necessary and almost beneficial, and that we are not here to find arguments condemning it, is the most evident proof of the perversion it has brought into the feelings, thoughts, and doings of men.

Who was ever bound to prove that hemlock seed can produce nothing but hemlock? that a son of brigands, brought up and living among brigands, can but grow to be a brigand himself?

Not so of war!

Mankind can prosper only by labor, wealth, justice, liberty. War stops labor, swallows up wealth, tramples upon justice and liberty.

It has been, alas! imposed sometimes in vindication of that which was sacred.

A nation tired of long oppression rises as one man and by dint of sacrifices and heroism secures her liberty by force of arms. But, before the spectacle of so many victims in the two hostile camps, of so many conflagrations, ruins and devastations; thinking of the brutal instincts awakened, strengthened, and even honored during the war, and of the bitterness it entails at its termination upon both the conquered and the conquerors, an honest man must feel that war, even when inevitable, is always sad and miserable.

And yet, it is surrounded in history by a dazzling halo of poetry and of glory; the most renowned poems in all ancient and modern literatures are hymns to war; the most stately monuments glorify warriors, and even now-a-days, because we want to suppress, in the so-called civilized world, this relic of barbarous ages, we are pointed to by a certain class of conceited literati and politicians as half-witted people or visionaries. The apologists of war repeating, like parrots,

the so oft confuted sentences of Hobbes, De Maistre and Hegel, maintain that war is not only fatally inherent in human nature, but also beneficial, being an instrument of civilization, fitted alone to revive in men the virtues of heroic sacrifice and self-denial. These apologists for war are, unconsciously to themselves, the strongest argument against it, proving, as they do, that from the intellectual and moral perversion emanating from war even those are not safe who, because of their talent and studies, should be the most averse to such a curse.

The position of these theorists is well known. It consists in considering events that have happened hitherto as if they were necessarily to be repeated forever, and in drawing from them immutable laws.

—E. T. Moneta, What is War? In Report of Fifth Universal Peace Congress, p. 105.

Yes, war is hell, as General Sherman long ago told us; but he did not go on to tell us why. There is only one possible reason. Hell is not a geographical term; it is merely the expression of the spiritual condition of its inhabitants. War is hell because it transforms men into devils. And how naturally the terminology of hell accommodates itself to it! In different columns of a single copy of the New York Herald, describing, I think, different engagements, I read that the soldiers "fought like demons," and "yelled like fiends." It is all so natural that probably no one noticed it but myself. And so we found in the case of the burning Spanish ship the word "inferno" seemed the most appropriate.

—Ernest H. Crosby, War from the Christian Point of View, p. 5.

## SUGGESTIVE POINTS FOR DISCUSSION

*Law,* the expression of right.

*Right,* the best way of doing things among men, that which makes for strength, happiness, and life.

*Peace,* the duration of law; the absence of violence in social and political relations.

"La paix est la durée du droit."—(Bourgeois.)

*War,* the expression of "unreasoning anger."

Coordinated and legalized violence to accomplish political ends. Meaning of battle, riot, brawl.

Two Kinds of Patriotism.

The old patriotism—tribal loyalty.

The new patriotism—faith in humanity.

Different Kinds of Peace.

Peace, as agreement among politicians.

Peace as exhaustion.

Peace of bankruptcy armed to the teeth. "The beggar crouching by the barrack-door."—(Gambetta.)

Peace of mutual respect and mutual understanding.

Considerations of War.

War as an impostor. Courage, self-restraint, magnanimity, daring, are not caused by war, but shown against its lurid background. Brave men chosen as soldiers; being fighters does not make men brave. Every war shows cowardice, murder, arson, graft, and leaves a trail of personal and national demoralization.

War as illegal. "Inter arma silent leges." Law and truth are silent when war is on.

The righteous cause no guarantee of success at arms. "God on the side of strong battalions."

War as immoral. That killing is made legal by war does not change its nature.

"Ef you take a sword an' dror it,
An' go stick a feller thru,
Guv'ment ain't to answer for it,
God'll send the bill to you."

—Lowell.

War as a counter-irritant to democracy.
"Gild the dome of the Invalides."
War for glory, for territory, for plunder. Gain through war no longer possible.—"The Great Illusion."
War as destructive of virility.
Euthenics and eugenics of war.
Reversal of selection.
Breeding from inferior stock the primal cause of "the drooping spirit" of Europe.

—From a Syllabus of Lectures by David Starr Jordan.

"War," says Colonel Gädke, "is the father of other wars. The more we think of our own power and ability, the oftener we have tasted of the fruit of victorious war, the more are we surrounded by the evil spirit of chauvinism and of imperialism. War is the father of other wars."

—Syndicates for War, p. 2.

## CHARACTERISTICS OF WAR

Dr. Johnson laughed much over Lord Kaimes' opinion that war was a good thing occasionally, as so much valor and virtue were exhibited in it. "A fire," said Johnson, "might as well be thought a good thing; there is the bravery and address of the firemen in extinguishing it; there is much humanity exerted in saving the lives and properties of the poor sufferers; yet after all, who can say a fire is a good thing?"

—Boswell's "Life," quoted in The Passing of War, by W. L. Grane, p. 248. (The Macmillan Co., Publishers.)

Surely no civilized community in our day can resist the

conclusion that the killing of man by man as a means of settling international disputes is the foulest blot upon human society and the greatest curse of human life, and that as long as men continue thus to kill one another they have slight claim to rank as civilized, since in this respect they remain savages. The crime of war is inherent: it awards victory not to the nation which is right but to that which is strong.

In man's triumphant upward march he has outgrown many savage habits. He no longer eats his fellows, or buys and sells them, or sacrifices prisoners of war, or puts vanquished garrisons to the sword, or confiscates private property, poisons wells, or sacks cities. . . .

If all civilized people now regard these former atrocities of war as disgraceful to humanity, how long will it be before their successors will regard the root of these barbarities, war itself, as unworthy of uncivilized men, and discard it? We are marching fast to that day through the reign of law under which civilized people are compelled to live. No citizen of a civilized nation is permitted to-day to wage war against his fellow citizen or to redress his own wrongs, real or fancied. Even if insulted, he can legally use force only sufficient to protect himself; then the law steps in and administers punishment to the aggressor based upon evidence. Hence, if a citizen attempts to sit as judge in his own case or to redress his wrongs in case of dispute with another, he breaks the law. Now, nations being only aggregations of individuals, why should they be permitted to wage war against other nations, when, if all were classed as citizens of one nation, they would be denied this right of war and would have to subject themselves to the reign of law? Not long can this continue and commend itself to the judgment of intelligent men.

—Andrew Carnegie, Peace *Versus* War: The President's Solution in Documents of the American Association for International Conciliation, 1910.

It is an awful feature in the character of war, and a strong reason why it should not be countenanced, that it involves the innocent with the guilty in the calamities it inflicts, and often falls with the greatest vengeance on those who have had no concern in the management of national affairs. It surely is not a crime to be born in a country which is afterward invaded; yet in how many instances do war-makers punish or destroy for no other crime than being a native or resident of an invaded territory! A mode of revenge or redress which makes no distinction between the innocent and the guilty ought to be discountenanced by every friend to justice and humanity. Besides, as the rulers of a nation are as liable as other people to be governed by passion and prejudice, there is as little prospect of justice in permitting war for the decision of national disputes as there would be in permitting an incensed individual to be, in his own cause, complainant, witness, judge, jury, and executioner. In what point of view then is war not to be regarded with horror?

That wars have been so overruled by God as to be the occasion of some benefits to mankind will not be denied; for the same may be said of every custom that ever was popular among men. War may have been the occasion of advancing useful arts and sciences, and even of spreading the gospel; but we are not to do evil that good may come, nor to countenance evil because God may overrule it for good.

—Noah Worcester, A Solemn Review of the Custom of War, p. 16.

I join with you most cordially in rejoicing at the return of peace. I hope it will be lasting, and that mankind will at length, as they call themselves reasonable creatures, have reason enough to settle their differences without cutting throats; *for, in my opinion, there never was a good war or*

*a bad peace.* What vast additions to the conveniences and comforts of life might mankind have acquired, if the money spent in wars had been employed in works of public utility! What an extension of agriculture, even to the tops of the mountains; what rivers rendered navigable, or joined by canals; what bridges, aqueducts, new roads, and other public works, edifices and improvements, rendering England a complete paradise, might not have been obtained by spending those millions in doing good, which in the last war have been spent in doing mischief—in bringing misery into thousands of families, and destroying the lives of so many working people, who might have performed the useful labors.

I agree with you perfectly in your disapprobation of war. Abstracted from the inhumanity of it, I think it wrong in point of human providence. For whatever advantages one nation would obtain from another, whether it be part of their territory, the liberty of commerce with them, free passage on their rivers, etc., etc., it would be much cheaper to purchase such advantages with ready money than to pay the expense of acquiring it by war. An army is a devouring monster, and when you have raised it you have, in order to subsist it, not only the fair charges of pay, clothing, provision, arms and ammunition, with numberless other contingent and just charges, to answer and satisfy, but you have all the additional knavish charges of the numerous tribe of contractors to defray, with those of every other dealer who furnishes the articles wanting for your army, and takes advantage of that want to demand exorbitant prices. It seems to me that if statesmen had a little more arithmetic, or were more accustomed to calculation, wars would be much less frequent. I am confident that Canada might have been purchased from France for a tenth part of the money England spent in the conquest of it. And if, instead of fighting with us for the power of taxing us, she had kept us in a good

humor by allowing us to dispose of our own money, and now and then giving us a little of hers by way of donation to colleges or hospitals, or for cutting canals or fortifying ports, she might easily have drawn from us much more by our occasional voluntary grants and contributions than ever she could by taxes. Sensible people will give a bucket or two of water to a dry pump that they may afterward get from it all they have occasion for. Her Ministry was deficient in that little point of common sense; and so they spent one hundred millions of her money, and after all lost what they contended for.

—Edwin D. Mead, Extracts from Letters of Franklin, in "Washington, Jefferson, and Franklin on War," pp. 8, 9.

**CAN WAR BE RIGHT?**

Napoleon declared it "the trade of barbarians." Wellington writes Lord Shaftesbury, "War is a most detestable thing. If you had seen but one day of war, you would pray God you might never see another." General Grant, offered a Military Review by the Duke of Cambridge, declined, saying he never wished to look upon a regiment of soldiers again. General Sherman writes he was "tired and sick of the war. Its glory is all moonshine. It is only those who have neither fired a shot nor heard the shrieks and groans of the wounded, who cry aloud for more blood, more vengeance, more desolation. War is hell."

—Andrew Carnegie, A League of Peace, pp. 39, 40.

Does not this work seem too like that of wild beasts or bulldogs, and prize-fighters? Separate the military hero himself from his bloody deeds; forget for a moment the cause of the war in which he fights—what are the personal motives, impulses, and passions roused into life and energy by fighting?

A Christian soldier once said to me confidentially, "I cannot bear to go into the presence of God so angry as I always become in battle."

—Rowland B. Howard.

Mankind generally are convinced of the abstract proposition that war is an evil, and that is my assumption. But I do not say or think that it is an unmixed evil; I freely admit that some good (along with a vast preponderance of harm) has come from wars. It would, perhaps, be hard to find an unmixed evil in the world. Providence, said a great divine, brings good from everything, even from the worst sufferings and most atrocious crimes. "But sufferings and crimes," he was careful to add, "are not therefore to be set down among our blessings." Murder may shorten a tyrant's career of guilt; robbery may circulate the useless hoards of a miser; despotism may be the means of suppressing anarchy and establishing social order, just as anarchy and revolutionary violence may be the means of driving despotism into constitutional courses. But we do not, therefore, bless the tyrant and the anarchist or canonize robbery and murder. There are some manufactures whose by-products are very profitable. It would be absurd to call the by-products of war 'profitable.' Its apologists claim that it may call forth an indignant patriotism, a fervent public spirit, generous daring, heroic self-sacrifice. So may a fire, a pestilence, a railway accident, an explosion in a mine, a shipwreck. But do we pray for these catastrophes or welcome them when they come, because they call forth great virtues, and testify, as it were, to the inborn greatness of human nature? On the contrary, every man with a grain of public spirit, every government with a spark of humanity, endeavors to prevent and mitigate such catastrophes as these.

There is another and more intimate view of war, which

should lead us to regard it as a far greater evil than any natural calamity or any series of natural calamities, that might do the same amount of damage to life and property. To go to war is to enthrone force and defy justice. What distinguishes war is not death, or disease, or destruction, or the other visible woes that are drawn in its train. What distinguishes war and makes it the worst of all evils is not that man is thereby slain or despoiled, but that he is slain and despoiled by the cruelty, treachery, and injustice of his fellows. The *distinguishing* evil of war is *moral* evil. . . . "War," says Dr. Channing, "is the concentration of all human crimes. Under its standard gather violence, malignity, rage, fraud, perfidy, rapacity, and lust. If it only slew men it would do little. It turns man into a beast of prey. Here is the evil of war that man, made to be the brother, becomes the deadly foe of his kind; that man, whose duty it is to mitigate suffering, makes the infliction of suffering his study and end; that man, whose office it is to avert and heal the wounds which come from nature's powers, makes researches into nature's laws, and arms himself with her most awful forces, that he may become the destroyer of his race."

—Francis W. Hirst, The Arbiter in Council, pp. 18-20.

The change in the conception of war is a very great one. We had for a long time the mystical conception of war—that it was a divine instrument, and that frequently war was started by God. Now that is not my conception. My God does not make war; war is made by wicked men generally. Then we have had a scientific apology for war—the man who laid a good deal of stress upon the different races, the strong and noble races, the superior races which are to be kept noble and superior by war which eliminates the weakest ones; but the latest labors of ethnologists and anthropologists have revealed to us in an indisputable manner that those doctrines

of races to-day are untenable, that men are brothers, and that God made of one blood all the nations of the world. This is not simply the statement of one noble Hebrew who spoke in Athens, but it is the conception of scientists who are dealing with that question. There was also taught the idea that war was a necessary force of social progress; the great progress of the race was attained through warfare. I am very happy that in my own country at present the newer sociologists, our younger men, are laying stress upon what they call solidarity. Formerly it was taught that strength came from war; now they teach that war is the elimination of the strongest and of the best and of the noblest men. In former times it was thought that a nation in order to be strong must do all that it can do to weaken its neighbor. Now I think that in recent times we have seen, although the old idea still survives, the signs of something better. There are a great many things that I would like to say on this subject. I think that the agreements between my native land and England indicate a new departure. What has taken place under the administration and the efforts of Delcassé, the agreement in reference to Newfoundland and that in reference to Egypt, have been made upon a new basis; the basis adopted by the two governments was, *We must give up the things that mean most for the other.* It was owing to this new international maxim that we were able to settle that many-sided controversy in reference to other disputed points.

—Jean C. Bracq, in Reports of Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, 1905, p. 154.

Those who attribute moral benefits to war are guilty of an astonishing fallacy. They think merely of defense, never of attack.

"It is necessary to overcome some repugnance," says Sismondi, "to venture to say that war is necessary to humanity

—that even those private battles called duels preserve some of our virtues. Nevertheless, we have seen that when nations renowned of old for their valor have been freed from all danger, when they have been forbidden the use of arms, when they have lost the standard of honor which makes them brave death—we have seen them lose, along with their military courage, the very strength that keeps up the domestic virtues. We have seen them debased in peace by the very cause that exposed them to defeat. And we have convinced ourselves that to be worthy to live man must learn to brave danger and death."

These words are typical. Without doubt, to defend one's rights at peril of death is a most generous deed; without doubt, the communities unwilling to bring themselves to do so soon fall into the lowest state of degradation; only—we forget the other side of the question. That the A's should be obliged to defend their rights with their lives, there must perforce be B's who violate those rights also at the risk of their lives. Defense necessarily involves attack.

Another example: "Max Jahns finds nothing to say against war of expansion, but the wars that he prefers to all others are those waged in self-defense. They are the noblest and most glorious."

Mr. Jahns's blindness is truly surprising. How is a defensive war possible without an offensive war? The weakest house of cards will not fall unless it is blown upon. The timidest man in the world can live in tranquillity if nobody violates his rights; in other words, if nobody attacks him.

Mr. Jahns's book contains another pearl of one-sided reasoning. He justifies war on the ground that it is a right. He says, "The first and most evident right of all is the right to live." Assuredly. But it is not the right to kill. Now, without murderers, there never would be any murdered. . . .

In short, to risk one's life in defending one's rights, to

prefer death to disgrace, is great, beautiful, generous. But it is base and vile to violate the rights of others, to steal, pillage, despoil, and tyrannize over people's consciences. Now, every aggressor of necessity commits those misdeeds. Since there can be no war without an aggressor, war is one of the principal causes of the degradation of the human race.

—J. Novicow, War and Its Alleged Benefits, pp. 7-12. (Henry Holt & Co., Publishers.)

Ruskin once said that "war is the foundation of all high virtues and faculties of men." As well might the maker of phrases say that fire is the builder of the forest, for only in the flame of destruction do we realize the warmth and strength that lie in the heart of oak. Another writer, Hardwick, declares that "war is essential to the life of a nation; war strengthens a nation morally, mentally, and physically." Such statements as these set all history at defiance. War can only waste and corrupt. "All war is bad," says Benjamin Franklin, "some only worse than others." War has its origin in the evil passions of men, and even when unavoidable or righteous, its effects are most forlorn.

—David Starr Jordan, The Blood of the Nation, p. 49.

All have a confused feeling that war, when not for necessary defense, is immoral, absurd, contrary to civilization; but few are convinced that it is an evil that can be avoided.

In order to overcome the prejudice that war is a fatal necessity, it is not sufficient to convince the mind; one must do more, namely, educate the heart, and infuse into it feelings contrary to those which war has engendered there, namely, the love of our fellowmen, the feeling of human solidarity; one must above all create, or revive in those who already have a glimmer of it, the idea of a collective humanity.

—E. T. Moneta, in Report of Fifth Universal Peace Congress, p. 110.

So little civilized are we internationally that books are written about the rules of war; that the right of blockade is recognized between nations; that, because of brawls with which no outside party has any concern, the commerce of neutrals is interfered with, the property of their citizens often exposed to the ravages of war on land, while neutral governments, unlike the onlookers at a street fight, who content themselves with making a ring about the contestants, accept limitations upon their own conduct made by the fighters themselves. Can we not learn that there is no more dignity, no more glory, about a national dispute, about a national conflict, than there is in a duel between two neighbors over the proper placing of a line fence?

And if the well-being of the community demands that the quarrels of neighbors shall be determined by a legal court, if the rivalries of cities and states must find in this country their settlement in dispassionate tribunals, why should there not be, judicially at least, the United States of the world, with a tribunal capable of passing upon all international questions without restrictions?

We may here pride ourselves on believing that we are going with the swing of international feeling; that with the spread of intelligence, with a greater recognition of the equality of human beings, which in the last analysis denies the right of one man to require another to sacrifice his life and property without just cause, duly ascertained by cold and competent tribunals, there must come a time when war will be looked upon as the crime that it is. The stars in their courses fight for us.

Let it not be said that I am inappreciative of the dignity of war and of the importance of the causes leading up to it. War has no dignity. It offers a tragedy and a farce. With the tragic element we are all too familiar. With the farce of it all we are less familiar, for it is one of those obvious things

—so obvious and so accustomed that, like the movement of the earth around the sun, eons of time pass by without its realization. What can be more farcical than that human beings should be dressed up in gold lace and waving plumes to go forth to slay other human beings in waving plumes and gold lace? Why should bearskin shakos be used to add ferocity to their ensemble? Why should the common people, whose interest in the matter is nil, make themselves food for powder, all for the benefit of the few whose tinsel decorations blind their own eyes and those of the beholders? And why should parents who love their offspring rush into opportunities of bequeathing to them legacies of national poverty and debt as the result of a display of passion on the part of the fathers? And when all this is the work of sentient human beings, may we not wonder over their effrontery in speaking of themselves as reasoning creatures? Are nations so rushing into conflict wiser than the mad bull in the arena that with lowered head dashes upon the sword of the matador? May we not conceive of a real philosopher looking down with wondering and puzzled contempt and amazement at our bloody antics over baubles?

—Jackson H. Ralston, Some Supposed Just Causes of War, pp. 8, 9.

I was at Gettysburg, July 1-4, 1863, with my brother, Gen. O. D. Howard, but not as a soldier. It was my first and only battlefield. I received there, not my first impressions, but by far my deepest conviction as to the real and essential character of war. The "pomp and circumstance" were not wanting as we broke camp at Leesburg, Va., and marched to the sound of music and under waving banners toward Pennsylvania. The report of the first gun following a distant flash and the slow rising of a puff of smoke over the woods excited a thrill of patriotic emotion. Our reenforcements

hurrying beyond the town to repel attacks already begun, and others hastening to gain and hold important positions on Cemetery Ridge, roused my honest sympathy. But when the first broken line of limping, bleeding "wounded" halted along the Baltimore turnpike, and I attempted, almost alone, the work of relief, I felt as never before war's cruel sacrifice of blood and limb and life. On the second evening of the battle the moon rose as peaceful-faced as ever and the silent stars looked down unchanged on the upturned, ghastly faces of our dead; the otherwise noiseless night resounded with cries of mortal agony from the dying around me. I said to myself, "O God, the moon and the stars Thou hast made, but not this miserable murder and mangling of men." It is not like nature; it is anti-natural; it is of the pit. On the third afternoon I went up, weary with hospital work, for a few moments' rest to the cupola of a farmhouse. The thin line of blue-coated soldiers seemed to waver along the summit of the ridge. I involuntarily prayed for their safety, my country, and for the right. Just then, above the rattling of musketry and the roar of artillery, there came a clap of thunder from a rapidly rising cloud. For a moment no other sound was heard. It was as if God were saying, "I am mightier than ye all! Hear my voice. Cease your mad and tumultuous strife!" Here the question came to me as never before, "Is this the work of God or of Satan? Is there no other way of settling human differences, establishing and confirming human rights? Do union, liberty, and law lie along no other road?"

—Rowland B. Howard, A Battle as it Appeared to an Eye-Witness.

## COMMON FALLACIES IN REGARD TO ARMAMENTS

"To keep the peace we must prepare for war." Some one said that long ago, and men have repeated it as though it

were a word from the mouth of God. Its hollowness is evident to any one who will look into it. The fact is that to keep the peace we must prepare for peace. If you want war, then prepare for war, multiply your guns, burnish them and make them shine, practice with them, keep the air filled with the reverberations of the roar of cannon. Swing your fleet from one ocean to another just when hearts are most irritated. Fill your newspapers with accounts of what your ships are doing, crowd your magazines with pictures of torpedo boats and destroyers. Set all the young men of the country thinking and talking about war, and then some day war will come. It is inevitable! If a nation does not want to fight it must put up its sword. It is amazing that there is an intelligent man on the earth who cannot see this.

"Our race is a fighting race. Men have always fought, therefore they always will fight, at least for ages yet to come. The process of evolution is slow. International action has always been selfish, it always will be selfish. Washington said: 'It is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another. It has been so, and must be so forever.' For generations, then, wars may be confidently expected. Preparedness is therefore a national duty." The nomenclature of all this is modern, but this method of argument is primitive. A man who argues thus has a mind which works exactly like the mind of a South Sea Islander. The islander had always been a cannibal, his parents had been cannibals, and his grandparents and all his ancestors back for hundreds of thousands of years. He said: "We have always eaten people, and therefore we always will. Our tribe has always been selfish, and it always will be. I propose to keep my knife sharp." Poor islander! he argued thus because he had never heard of Christ. Then one day he heard of him, and he quit eating people, and then his whole tribe quit, and a little later on all the tribes of the island quit, and nobody

on the island ever thinks nowadays of eating human flesh any more. Men that tell us that what men have done they must always do, argue up to their light, but they do not possess much, and should the world follow them it will find itself in a ditch.

—Charles E. Jefferson, Some Fallacies of Militarism, p. 6, in Publications of the American Peace Society.

It was Sir Edward Grey, Foreign Secretary in the present cabinet, who said the other day in the British Parliament, "The vastness of the expenditure on armament is a satire on modern civilization, and if continued it must lead Europe into bankruptcy." The security and prosperity of any nation depends upon its schools and its churches, its useful industries and its happy homes, a thousand times more than upon its army and navy. And the conceit of these militarists who are trying to throw dust in the eyes of the people would be funny if it were not so costly and so perilous to our national well-being.

The men who watch the world from that narrow station "behind the gun" are not competent leaders of public sentiment. The merchant and the mechanic, the wise lawyer and the skilled physician, the farmer and the miner, the trained teacher and the godly preacher, these men engaged in peaceful, useful industry are vastly more competent to see things as they are and to aid in shaping a wholesome public sentiment. International relationships are being formed to-day as never before in the history of the race through community of interest in trade and by those associations which come through literature, the work of education and religious affiliation. And it is for these men and women whose main interest lies in those peaceful, productive vocations to insist upon being heard.

But what are some of the reasons urged for this cruel and

costly outlay? "In time of peace prepare for war!" This stupid sentiment is trotted out as if it were a fragment from the wisdom of the ages. History as well as common sense laughs it to scorn. In time of peace prepare for peace! We did just that with England along our northern border, where for four thousand miles only an imaginary line divides us from one of the mightiest nations on earth.

—Charles R. Brown, Quoted in World Peace, by M. K. Reely, Extracts from pp. 11, 12.

When we see what awful burdens the armed peace has already laid upon the peoples—burdens which, through private sacrifices of individuals for their own sons in arms or for the maintenance of the armies in time of peace, represent a considerably greater sum than that given above—yet how immensely greater are the burdens and terrors which actual war brings with it, especially a future war in which such masses of men, furnished with the most perfect instruments of destruction, will fall upon one another. He who has once experienced the horrors of a war, who has seen with his own eyes the sorrow and misery following in its train (and there are many such among us), must agree with the statement, "War is an awful misfortune even for the victor." Certainly we in Germany can bear witness to this; we have felt it in our own persons; and still to-day the ruins of our old cities and villages proclaim the destructiveness of war; still to-day our chronicles tell of the fierceness and cruelty of soldiers whom war had brutalized, of plague and famine which nearly always following in the wake of armies have desolated our territories. Even if war, thanks to international agreements, is now more humane, if it is no longer waged against private citizens of hostile countries, from whom in former times fierce marauders took away their last possession, yet it has retained otherwise all of its horrors and bur-

dens, and the mere thought that thousands of brave, noble men in their best years shall be compelled to kill others and to be killed themselves, while the products of their industry, secured by years of painstaking labor, are lost perhaps forever, must fill every true friend of humanity with shame and horror. In a truly noble way and with the deepest feeling has our noble friend, the Baroness von Suttner, painted the horrors of war in "Die Waffen Nieder," a story which has been translated into nearly all modern languages. It fell like a kindling spark into ready material, and it has won for us a host of zealous coworkers.

Up to the present time, unfortunately, things are in such a state that in case of a war the entire strength of the nations participating will be brought into requisition; and in order that they may give their last man and their last penny it is necessary that before the war they should be brought into the right disposition and be kept thus while it is going on; for it is my deepest conviction that modern peoples do not wish war. Those who wish to wage war, or rather to keep up the possibility of war, are, in comparison with the millions of people at large, small in numbers, but—they are those in power. Here the peace associations must apply their lever, they must seek to bring to the consciousness of the masses the thought that wars are not something unavoidable, an institution established by God; that on the contrary through international arbitration even international strifes can be done away; that it is an unjustifiable prejudgment to think that a people sacrifices something of its dignity when it submits its case to a third party; in other words, that the principles which are the pillars of States and of modern human society must also come to prevail in politics and in the intercourse of peoples one with another.

—Adolph Richter, in Report of Fifth Universal Peace Congress, *1893*, pp. 116, 117.

Many examples might be cited to show the international activity of the great armament manufacturers of Europe. That all this diabolical activity makes for war is beyond all doubt. The good folk who sell Turkey a hundred million cartridges to-day would not be averse to a Balkan scare or even to a Balkan war, which would make Turkey want another hundred million to-morrow.

Then there is no knowing when some slight improvement in the rifle may render a dozen million firearms obsolete. This means untold expense for the people, and untold riches for the gunsmith. As a matter of fact, these improvements and alterations are going on almost continually, with the result that old-fashioned rifles are being continually sold to Albanians, Arabs, Abyssinians, Moors, Central Americans, Central Africans, Caucasians, Afghan raiders on the Indian frontier, Chinese, Gold Coast Negroes, and other primitive but warlike folks. Gentle little Japan recently sold scores of thousands of captured Russian rifles to some keen traders in Djibuti, who will probably sell them to Somaliland savages, Afridis, Arab slavers, or any other kind of cutthroat who is able to pay for them. This interesting little fact has become public because the *Times* is not at all anxious for the tribesmen on the northwest frontier of India to get good rifles. But what an enormous supply of discarded arms must find its way into the hands of the inferior races of the Dark Continent! Surely "civilization" has much to answer for in Africa, beginning with rum and ending with rifles!

—Syndicates for War, p. 11.

Said the late lamented Justice Brewer:

While I have an abiding faith that the tendency of American thought and purpose will ere long be reversed, no one can be blind to the fact that there is a persistent effort to make of this a great military nation. From the football

field to the ironclad, from the athlete to the admiral, the thought and the talk is fight. The cry is fight fair, but fight. The capital city has a different aspect from that which it had a few years ago. Brass buttons and epaulets are filling the eyes. Our newspapers are eulogizing the magnificence of our fleet and army, and the thought of the nation is largely in the direction of naval and military advance. Science is giving its attention to the discovery and manufacture of more instruments of death, and we are rapidly drifting into an admiration for the "pride, pomp, and circumstances of glorious war." At the First Hague Conference we were among those nations calling for a limitation of armament. Now, instead of leading in that direction, we are constantly increasing our armament and point with pride to the fact that our naval fighting strength surpasses that of every other nation excepting Great Britain.

—Quoted by Lucia Ames Mead, Swords and Ploughshares, pp. 68, 69.

**SOME CAUSES OF WAR**

A military class ambitious for activity and promotion.

Contempt for peoples who have not white skins.

Lack of power to put one's self in another's place, and of will to do justice.

Ignorant and perverse interpretation of the Bible, judging God's will by ancient Israel's barbaric deeds instead of by Christ's spirit.

Rich investors have much political power, and are made richer by war, while the masses are impoverished. Most wars would end quickly were war loans impossible.

"The vast expenditure on armaments, the costly wars, the grave risks and embarrassments of foreign policy, the stop-

page of political and social reforms within Great Britain, though fraught with injury to the nation, have served well the business interests of certain industries and professions." —JOHN ATKINSON HOBSON.

"That original sin of nations—the greed of territorial aggrandizement."—GLADSTONE.

"You push into territories where you have no business to be and where you had promised not to go. Your intrusion provokes resentment, and resentment means resistance. You instantly cry out that the people are rebellious, in spite of your own assurance that you have no intention of setting up a permanent sovereignty over them. You send a force to stamp out the rebellion. Having spread bloodshed, confusion, and anarchy, you declare, with hands uplifted to the heavens, that moral reasons force you to stay. These are the five stages in the Forward Rake's Progress."—JOHN MORLEY.

Investors. Foreign investments are enormously increasing in weak and poorly governed countries. Poor Asiatics are supposed to be better customers than our own Negroes and poor whites and South Americans. Put this year's naval budget into Southern schools, create new wants and resources, and we should have immensely large sales near home.

The Sensational Press. It enlarges on every misunderstanding and evil rumor. It exaggerates and distorts news with false head-lines—anything to create a fever, sell papers, and coin money. Its readers are fooled, and fooled all the time.

—LUCIA AMES MEAD, A Primer of the Peace Movement.

War comes to-day as the result of one of three causes: either actual or threatened wrong by one country to another, or suspicion by one country that another intends to do it

wrong, and upon that suspicion, instinct leads the country that suspects the attack, to attack first; or, from bitterness of feeling, dependent in no degree whatever upon substantial questions of difference; and that bitterness of feeling leads to suspicion, and suspicion in the minds of those who suspect and who entertain the bitter feeling, is justification for war. It is their justification to themselves. The least of these three causes of war is actual injustice. There are to-day's acts of injustice being perpetrated by one country upon another, there are several situations in the world to-day where gross injustice is being done. I will not mention them, because it would do more harm than it would good, but they are few in number. By far the greatest cause of war is that suspicion of injustice, threatened and intended, which comes from exasperated feeling. Now, feeling, the feeling which makes one nation willing to go to war with another, makes real causes of difference of no consequence. If the people of two countries want to fight, they will find an excuse—a pretext—find what seems to them sufficient cause, in anything. Questions which can be disposed of without the slightest difficulty between countries really friendly, are insoluble between countries really unfriendly. And the feeling between the people of different countries is the product of the acts and the words of the peoples of the countries themselves, not of their governments. Insult, contemptuous treatment, bad manners, arrogant and provincial assertion of superiority are the chief causes of war to-day.

And in this country of ours, we are not free from being guilty of all those great causes of war. The gentlemen who introduced into the Legislatures of California, Montana, and Nevada, the legislation regarding the treatment of the Japanese in those states, doubtless had no conception of the fact that they were offering to that great nation of gentlemen, of soldiers, of scholars and scientists, of statesmen, a nation

worthy of challenging and receiving the respect, the honor and the homage of mankind, an insult that would bring on private war in any private relation in our own country. Thank Heaven, the wiser heads and the sounder hearts, instructed and enlightened upon the true nature of the proceedings, prevailed and overcame the inconsiderate and thoughtless.

There are no two men . . . who can not bring on private war between themselves by an insult without any cause or reason, and it is so with the nations, for national pride, national sensitiveness, sense of national honor, are more keenly alive to insult than can be the case with any individual. But a few days ago, a member of the House of Representatives charged upon the Chief Magistrate of the little Republic of Panama a fraudulent conspiracy with regard to a contract under a negotiation by the government of that country regarding the forests of Panama. All Panama was instantly alive with just indignation. This insult was felt all the more keenly because we, with our ninety millions and our great navy and army, presented an overwhelming and irresistible force toward a little Republic whose sovereignty we are bound, trebly bound, in honor to maintain and respect.

These are the things that make for war and if you would make for peace, you will frown upon them, condemn them, ostracize and punish by all social penalties the men who are guilty of them, until it is understood and felt that an insult to a friendly foreign power is a disgrace to the insulter, upon a level with the crimes that we denounce and for which the law inflicts disgraceful punishment.

Two thirds of the suspicion, the dislike, the distrust with which our country was regarded by the people of South America, was the result of the arrogant and contemptuous bearing of Americans, of people of the United States, for those gentle, polite, sensitive, imaginative, delightful people.

Allusion has been made to my visit there, to the generous, magnanimous hospitality that they have inherited from their ancestors of Spain and Portugal, and that opened wide the gateway of their land and their hearts to a message of courtesy and kindly consideration. No questions existed before to be settled, no serious questions have been settled, but the difference between the feeling, the attitude, of the people of Latin America and our Republic to-day from what it was four years ago, is the result of the conspicuous substitution of the treatment that one gentleman owes to another, for the treatment that one blackguard pays to another.

Now this is the subject for you to deal with. The government cannot reach it. Laws cannot control it; public opinion, public sentiment must deal with it, and when public opinion has risen to such height all over the world, that the peoples of every country treat the peoples of every other country with the human kindness that binds home communities together, you will see an end of war—and not until then.

—Elihu Root, Causes of War, pp. 5-8, in Documents of The American Association for International Conciliation, 1909.

The causes of war may be roughly, and of course superficially and generally distributed into three categories. First, there are the real differences between nations as to their respective rights. One nation claims territory and another claims the same territory. One nation claims the right to trade in a particular way, at a particular place, and another nation claims an exclusive right. There are a myriad ways in which nations may come into dispute regarding real rights, each nation believing that its side of the controversy is based upon justice. A second category is what I might call that of policy. The policy of a country may be to push its trade, to acquire territory, to obtain a dominant influence, to insist

upon a certain course of action by other countries for its own protection asserting that a different course of conduct would be dangerous to its safety. All those questions of policy, however, are to a considerable degree, and very frequently, dependent upon the determination of certain facts and the decision of certain questions of international law.

A third category of causes of war may be described as being matters of feeling. Deep and bitter feeling is often awakened between peoples of different countries. We have got away from the time when the pique or whim of an individual monarch may plunge his subjects into a bloody and devastating war, but we remain in the time when great masses of people in different countries may become indignant over some slight or insult, or a course of conduct which they deem to be injurious and unfair. These matters of feeling, which are the most dangerous of all causes of war because they make the peoples of two different countries want to fight—these matters of feeling ordinarily depend in the beginning upon different views regarding the specific rights of the two countries.

—Elihu Root, The Importance of Judicial Settlement, Extracts from pp. 4-6, in Judicial Settlement of International Disputes.

It is only by a knowledge of the sources that we can be guided to the remedies of war. And here, I doubt not, many will imagine that the first place ought to be given to malignity and hatred. But justice to human nature requires that we ascribe to national animosities a more limited operation than is usually assigned to them in the production of this calamity. It is indeed true that ambitious men who have an interest in war too often accomplish their views by appealing to the malignant feelings of a community, by exaggerating its wrongs, ridiculing its forbearance, and reviving ancient

jealousies and resentments. But it is believed that, were not malignity and revenge aided by the concurrence of higher principles, the false splendor of this barbarous custom might easily be obscured and its ravages stayed.

One of the great springs of war may be found in a very strong and general propensity of human nature, in the love of excitement, of emotion, of strong interest—a propensity which gives a charm to those bold and hazardous enterprises which call forth all the energies of our nature. No state of mind, not even positive suffering, is more painful than the want of interesting objects. The vacant soul preys on itself, and often rushes with impatience from the security which demands no effort to the brink of peril. This part of human nature is seen in the kind of pleasures which have always been preferred. Why has the first rank among sports been given to the chase? Because its difficulties, hardships, hazards, tumults awaken the mind and give to it a new consciousness of existence and a deep feeling of its powers. What is the charm which attaches the statesman to an office which almost weighs him down with labor and an appalling responsibility? He finds much of his compensation in the powerful emotion and interest awakened by the very hardships of his lot, by conflicting with vigorous minds, by the opposition of rivals, and by the alternations of success and defeat. . . . We have here one spring of war. War is of all games the deepest, awakening most powerfully the soul, and, of course, presenting powerful attraction to those restless and adventurous minds which pant for scenes of greater experiment and exposure than peace affords. The savage, finding in his uncultivated modes of life few objects of interest, few sources of emotion, burns for war as a field for his restless energy. Civilized men, too, find a pleasure in war, as an excitement of the mind. They follow with an eager concern the movements of armies, and wait the issue of battles

with a deep suspense, an alternation of hope and fear, inconceivably more interesting than the unvaried uniformity of peaceful pursuits.

Another powerful principle of our nature, which is the spring of war, is the passion for superiority, for triumph, for power. The human mind is aspiring, impatient of inferiority, and eager for preeminence and control. I need not enlarge on the predominance of this passion in rulers whose love of power is influenced by the possession, and who are ever restless to extend their sway. It is more important to observe that, were this desire restrained to the breasts of rulers, war would move with a sluggish pace. But the passion for power and superiority is universal; and as every individual, from his intimate union with the community, is accustomed to appropriate its triumphs to himself, there is a general promptness to engage in any contest by which the community may obtain an ascendency over other nations. The desire that our country should surpass all others would not be criminal did we understand in what respects it is most honorable for a nation to excel; did we feel that the glory of a state consists in intellectual and moral superiority, in preeminence of knowledge, freedom, and purity. But to the mass of a people this form of preeminence is too refined and unsubstantial. There is another kind of triumph which they better understand—the triumph of physical power, triumph in battle, triumph not over the minds, but the territory of another state. Here is a palpable, visible superiority; and for this a people are willing to submit to severe privations. A victory blots out the memory of their sufferings, and in boasting of their extended power they find a compensation for many woes.

I now proceed to another powerful spring of war; and it is the admiration of the brilliant qualities displayed in war. These qualities, more than all things, have prevented an im-

pression of the crimes and miseries of this savage custom. Many delight in war not for its carnage and woes, but for its valor and apparent magnanimity, for the self-command of the hero, the fortitude which despises suffering, the resolution which courts danger, the superiority of the mind to the body, to sensation, to fear. Let us be just to human nature even in its errors and excesses. Men seldom delight in war considered merely as a source of misery. When they hear of battles, the picture which rises to their view is not what it should be, a picture of extreme wretchedness, of the wounded, the mangled, the slain. These horrors are hidden under the splendor of those mighty energies which break forth amidst the perils of conflict, and which human nature contemplates with an intense and heart-thrilling delight. Attention hurries from the heaps of the slaughtered to the victorious chief, whose single mind pervades and animates a host and directs with stern composure the storm of battle; and the ruin which he spreads is forgotten in admiration of his power. This admiration has in all ages been expressed by the most unequivocal signs. Why that garland? that arch erected? that festive board spread? These are tributes to the warrior. While the peaceful sovereign, who scatters blessing with the silence and constancy of Providence, is received with a faint applause, men assemble in crowds to hail the conqueror, perhaps a monster in human form, whose private life is blackened with lust and crime, and whose greatness is built on perfidy and usurpation. Thus war is the surest and speediest road to renown; and war will never cease while the field of battle is the field of glory, and the most luxuriant laurels grow from a root nourished with blood.

—William E. Channing, Discourses on War, pp. 25-29.

The great majority of wars during the last thousand years may be classified under three heads: Wars produced by

opposition of religious belief, wars resulting from erroneous economical notions either concerning the balance of trade or the material advantages of conquest, and wars resulting from the collision of the two hostile doctrines of the Divine right of kings and the rights of nations. In the first instance knowledge has gained a decisive victory, and in the second almost a decisive victory.

—W. E. H. Lecky, Rationalism in Europe, p. 6.

The passion for power is one of the most universal passions; nor is it to be regarded as a crime in all its forms. Sweeping censures on a natural sentiment cast blame on the Creator. This principle shows itself in the very dawn of our existence. The child never exults and rejoices more than when it becomes conscious of power by overcoming difficulties or compassing new ends. All our desires and appetites lend aid and energy to this passion, for all find increase of gratification in proportion to the growth of our strength and influence. We ought to add that this principle is fed from nobler sources. Power is a chief element of all the commanding qualities of nature. It enters into all the higher virtues, such as magnanimity, fortitude, constancy. It enters into intellectual eminence. . . .

Ambition chiefly covets power over our fellow creatures. It is this which has instigated more crime and spread more misery than any other cause. We are not, however, to condemn even this universally. There is a truly noble sway of man over man, one which it is our honor to seek and exert, which is earned by well-doing, which is a chief recompense of virtue. We refer to the quickening influence of a good and great mind over other minds, by which it brings them into sympathy with itself. Far from condemning this, we are anxious to hold it forth as the purest glory which virtuous ambition can propose. The power of awakening, enlighten-

ing, elevating our fellow creatures may with peculiar fitness be called divine; for there is no agency of God so beneficent and sublime as that which he exerts on rational natures and by which he assimilates them to himself. This sway over other souls is the surest test of greatness. . . .

But the highest aim of all authority is to confer liberty. This is true of domestic rule. The great, we may say the single, object of parental government, of a wise and virtuous education, is to give the child the fullest use of his own powers; to give him inward force; to train him up to govern himself. The same is true of the authority of Jesus Christ. He came indeed to rule mankind, but to rule them not by arbitrary statutes, not by force and menace, but by mere will, but by setting before them, in precept and life, those everlasting rules of rectitude which heaven obeys and of which every soul contains the living germ. . . .

Of civil government too, the great end is to secure freedom. Its proper and highest function is to watch over the liberties of each and all, and to open to a community the widest field for all its powers. Its very chains and prisons have the general freedom for their aim. They are just only when used to curb oppression and wrong; to disarm him who has a tyrant's heart if not a tyrant's power, who wars against others rights, who by invading property or life would substitute force for the reign of equal laws. Freedom—we repeat it—is the end of government. To exalt men to self-rule is the end of all other rule; and he who would fasten on them his arbitrary will is their worst foe.

The guilt of this passion for dominion may also be discerned, and by some more clearly, in its outward influences—in the desolation, bloodshed, and woe of which it is the perpetual cause. *We owe to it almost all the miseries of war.* To spread the sway of one or a few, thousands and millions have been turned into machines under the names of soldiers,

armed with instruments of destruction, and then sent to reduce others to their own lot by fear and pain, by fire and sword, by butchery and pillage. And is it light guilt to array man against his brother; to make murder the trade of thousands; to drench the earth with human blood; to turn it into a desert; to scatter families like chaff; to make mothers widows and children orphans; and to do all this for the purpose of spreading a still gloomier desolation, for the purpose of subjugating men's souls, turning them into base parasites, extorting from them in their own eyes, and breaking them to servility as the chief duty of life? When the passion for power succeeds, as it generally has done, in establishing despotism, it seems to make even civilization a doubtful good.

—William E. Channing, Discourses on War, pp. 127-141.

The first reason for all wars, and for the necessity of national defenses, is that the majority of persons, high and low, in all European nations, are Thieves, and, in their hearts, greedy of their neighbor's goods, land, and fame.

But besides being Thieves, they are also fools, and have never yet been able to understand that if Cornish men want pippins cheap, they must not ravage Devonshire—that the prosperity of their neighbors is, in the end, their own also; and the poverty of their neighbors, by the communism of God, becomes also in the end their own.

—John Ruskin.

The printing press has disseminated the principles of peace, it has bound the nations together, by the interchange of thought, lifting them towards the same moral and spiritual plane. But it has sown tares with the wheat. Literature is charged with a martial spirit. Physical violence and in-

human cruelty are the substance of the most thrilling scenes in fiction. History, oratory, poetry, and art combine to exalt and embellish the triumphs of war.

—Augustine Jones, War—Unnecessary and Unchristian, p. 13.

Upon the writer of newspaper headlines and editorials there is a greater moral responsibility than upon the average citizen. Let him read and reflect upon these words of that noble patriot, John Hay:

"If the press of the world would adopt and persist in the high resolve that war should be no more, the clang of arms would cease from the rising of the sun to its going down, and we should fancy that at last our ears, no longer stunned by the din of battle, might hear the morning stars singing together and all the sons of God shouting for joy."

—Lucia Ames Mead, Swords and Ploughshares, p. 68.

## SIGNS OF PROGRESS

The diminution of war and the establishment of law and order in a greater or less degree over the habitable globe are encouraging. But what of the establishment of conscription on the Continent of Europe, in Japan, and in some of the South American Republics, together with this vast increase in the military and naval budgets of all the principal states and kingdoms of the world during the last forty years? In the very act of establishing a precarious peace have we not robbed it of half its fruits?

Our answer must be that the good achieved far outweighs the accompanying evil. The average European has been incomparably better off morally and physically during the last half century than he ever was before. Progress has been incomparably more rapid. The establishment of peace as

the normal condition of states for the first time since the collapse of the Roman Empire, and of personal freedom as the normal condition of individuals for the first time in history, are unexhausted and inexhaustible improvements. They cannot, humanly speaking, cease to work for good. Civilized man has had his first long taste of secured freedom. He has felt the advantage of industry over barbarism, of the rule of justice over the rule of the stronger. True, more wealth has been wasted on war and armaments during the last century than in any previous century; but the sum wasted in proportion to income has been considerably less. The world is clearly passing from the stage of militarism into the stage of industrialism. In the eighteenth century almost the whole produce of taxation was spent on defense and police. Popular government has already seized upon large sums for education and public health, for roads, parks, and the like. It is every day asking for more. Only by looking back can we measure the rate of progress or even realize that we are progressing.

—Francis W. Hirst, The Arbiter in Council, p. 45.

## CHAPTER IV

## THE CONSEQUENCES OF WAR

War has brought low our conception of the *preciousness of human life,* as slavery brought low our conception of human liberty.

As peace-lovers, we are charged with the sanctity of human life;
As democrats and freemen we are charged with its sovereignty.

—The Survey.

### COST OF WAR IN LIFE, PROPERTY, AND PROSPERITY

Were half the power that fills the world with terror,
Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts,
Given to redeem the human mind from error,
There were no need of arsenals or forts.

—Longfellow.

"The problem is vital and for its solution it is essential to know the facts."

The whole amount of property in the United States is probably of far less value than what has been expended and destroyed within two centuries by wars in Christendom. Suppose then, that one fifth of this amount had been judiciously laid out by peace associations in the different states and nations in cultivating the spirit and arts of peace, and in exciting a just abhorrence of war, would not the other

four fifths have been in a great measure saved, besides many millions of lives and an immense portion of misery? Had the whole value of what has been expended in wars been appropriated to the promotion of peace, how laudable would have been the appropriation and how blessed the consequences! —NOAH WORCESTER, A Solemn Review of the Custom of War, p. 5.

It is very difficult to put into figures, in any satisfactory way, the cost of war. The losses in life, in money, in destruction of property, in the derangement of business, in the curtailing of productive industry, in the impairment of health and the power to labor, are so great and have ramifications in so many directions that anything more than approximate estimates of the economic losses caused by war are impossible.

It has been estimated that the aggregate loss of life in all the wars which have occurred since the beginning of authentic history, has been not less than 15,000,000,000.

Forty thousand millions of dollars is a sum so vast that the mention of it leaves only a confused impression upon the mind; but that is about what the nations have paid in solid cash in a single century for the folly and wickedness of their quarrels and fightings, their mutual injustices and slaughters. But this is not by any means the whole of the huge "butcher's bill," as we shall see.

If it is difficult to determine with even approximate accuracy the cost of war in direct money outlay, it is still harder to ascertain the waste which it occasions through immediate destruction of property. Here almost no figures are available. General Sherman estimated that property to the amount of at least three hundred millions of dollars was destroyed outright by his army during the march to the sea.

In the past century, especially toward its close, the destruction of property in war was of course much less than it had been in previous times. International law has, theoretically at least, and often in fact made private property on land immune from seizure and destruction in war time. The Russo-Japanese war, therefore, costly and deadly as it was, resulted in comparatively small destruction of property, though at Port Arthur and in the region of the great army movements in Manchuria there was necessarily much property swept away, however careful the commanders were to observe the "laws of war." In the Philippine campaigns and the Boxer "punishment" destruction of property was large, as was the case also in the Boer war, where the "farm burnings" recalled the cruel days when nothing was sacred in the eyes of ravaging armies.

The Franco-Prussian war, the Russo-Turkish, the Crimean, the Italian, the Austro-Prussian, the Danish, the Mexican, the Opium, the British-American of 1812, and the numerous colonial wars of the century left each its sad legacy of destroyed property, the amount of which can never be calculated.

The Napoleonic wars, a hundred years ago, in which "laws of war" were not much in evidence, were immensely destructive of property. In some of the campaigns the losses through the burning of cities and the plundering done by the soldiers probably equaled if they did not surpass, all that was paid out in money. Back of that time, through the Middle Ages and the early periods of history, when war was incessant and armies lived largely off the countries through which they passed, and sacked and pillaged cities, the destruction of property attending warfare was always very great.

But there is still another field in which the cost of war is in the long run very much greater than the direct money expenditures and the immediate loss in destruction of prop-

erty combined. The cost of war does not stop when hostilities are over and the armies have returned home. Its burdens continue indefinitely in pensions, in interest, in prostrated business and disordered finance, in the absence from productive occupations of men who have been destroyed, and in the heavier military burdens imposed by the preparation for future hostilities, the dread of which is left behind.

For full record of cost of war see, The Cost of War, by Benjamin F. Trueblood, published by the American Peace Society; The Future of War, by Jean De Bloch, and for The Cost of Armaments to "The Drain of Armaments," published by The World Peace Foundation.

It is a sad fact that sixty-seven per cent of the expenses of our government are being expended either because of past wars or in preparation for possible future wars. It has been well illustrated by a man having an income of $1,000 a year who is spending $670 to pay for the expenses of former fights or in preparation for new ones, and is leaving himself only $330 for house rent, food, clothing, fuel, education of his children, etc. Last year (1911) the figures show that the United States spent on preparations for future war a per capita of about $3.33. Of this total sum we Congregationalists, therefore, have had to pay over $2,250,000, or three times as much as we have given for foreign missions. The condition across the sea of course is worse than it is with us. The annual German expenditure is $731,000,000, and of this $318,000,000 is spent for war expenses in one way or another. It is stated that every farmer in Germany is burdened with the equivalent of the maintenance of six non-producing men in arms. Four million men are under arms in Europe at an annual expense of $1,682,000,000, thus absorbing the life of these nations. If these conditions can be changed, and the fear of war removed by arbitration

agreements, not only will the bulk of this immense sum be saved, but these men themselves could be returned to the ranks of peaceful citizens, and perhaps be able to earn as much besides.

—Samuel B. Capen, Foreign Missions and World Peace.

The vast destructions of war are mainly a destruction of capital. War cannot be carried on except by means of property actually existing, nor for any length of time, or to any extent, except by means of property existing in the form of capital. These savings previously employed productively, are the source whence war supplies are drawn; the capital is absolutely destroyed; the war debt remaining is only a memorial of this destruction, and an obligation resting upon somebody to create new capital with which to replace the old; the debt does not carry on the war, but transfers the capital from individuals to the government; and war, accordingly, is the greatest enemy to exchanges, because it annihilates a portion of the central agencies which carry them forward.

—Arthur L. Perry, Elements of Political Economy, p. 233.
(Used by Permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.)

Fortunately, one great point has already been won. Nobody nowadays asserts that war is lucrative. Formerly the opinion that war brought material benefits to the victors was universally accepted. But for two centuries the economists have been fighting with indomitable energy to prove that this notion is erroneous.

—J. Novicow, War and Its Alleged Benefits, p. 35.
(Henry Holt & Co., Publishers.)

It is upon the manual workers, the majority of whose incomes are small and barely suffice for the fuller needs of

life, that the regular taxes levied to maintain a military equipment in time of peace, and the exceptional taxes levied to meet the drains of war fall most heavily. Not that they necessarily pay the largest share, but because every dollar drawn from the resources of the man with little income represents in reality a heavier burden, is a more real sacrifice, than perhaps ten or twenty times as much taken from the income of one who is better off.

—Charles Patrick Neill, The Interest of the Wage-Earner in the Present Status of the Peace Movement, American Association for International Conciliation, 1912, p. 8.

Even the return of peace after a protracted war, usually brings with it a certain form of temporary disaster to the wage-earner.

The very bane of existence to the man who works with his hands for a daily wage, the specter that haunts him through all the days of his working life, is the fear of unemployment. This "economic insecurity" of the wage-earner is, in fact, one of the most serious defects of our social system to-day.

When a war ends that has drawn heavily from the ranks of the wage-earner, there is always a period required for industry to readjust itself to a normal basis. In the defeated country, especially, the recovery of industry is slow; and along with this, a large number of troops is suddenly released from military service and added to the ranks of those seeking employment, and the struggle for work then takes on one of its saddest and most tragic aspects.

—Charles Patrick Neill, The Interest of the Wage-Earner in the Present Status of the Peace Movement, American Association for International Conciliation, pp. 9, 10.

If a thousandth part of what has been expended in war and preparing its mighty engines had been devoted to the development of reason and the diffusion of Christian principles, nothing would have been known for centuries past of its terrorrs, its sufferings, its impoverishment, and its demoralization, but what was learned from history.

—Horace Mann.

## PROPORTIONATE NATIONAL EXPENDITURES

For past wars and for preparation for future wars, the United States, protected by two oceans, without an enemy in the whole world, is paying *about seventy cents out of every dollar of its income,* leaving only thirty cents of every dollar to spend on all national necessities and constructive work. Imagine, my dear householder, spending seventy per cent of your family income on stone-walls and moats, burglar alarms and bull-dogs, and having only thirty per cent left for the housing, clothing, and education of your family. For the national family, Uncle Sam has thirty cents on the dollar left for the payment of Congress, the President, Cabinet, all the federal courts, federal prisons, custom house buildings and officers, post-office buildings, coast-guard, light-houses, census, printing, diplomatic and consular service, forestry, waterways, quarantine, irrigation, agricultural and other departments, mints, etc.

—Lucia Ames Mead, Swords and Ploughshares, pp. 25, 26.

In Austria in 1896, £13,500,000 was devoted to the army and fleet, while only £2,850,000, or 4½ times less, was devoted to popular education. In Italy in the same year the expenditure on armaments was £12,650,000, while £1,500,000, or eight times less, was spent upon education. In France £32,400,000 is spent upon the army, and £6,600,000, or a

fifth part, on education generally. In Russia the army devours £41,520,000, while education receives but £3,540,000, that is, a little more than a twelfth.

—Jean de Bloch, The Future of War, Extract from pp. 137-139.

Our navy cost in round figures in 1881, $13,000,000; in 1891, $22,000,000; in 1901, $56,000,000; in 1911, $121,000,000; in 1912, $130,000,000; and in 1913, $146,000,000. "Its yearly expenses exceed the endowment revenues of all the universities of the world—the foundations of intellectual advancement. They exceed the cost of maintenance of all industrial and technical schools of all grades, including all colleges of engineering and agriculture—the foundation of the world's industrial advancement." Militarism is confined to no country. It is a world issue and so powerfully entrenched that to dethrone it, from Christian sentiment alone, is one of the mightiest tasks of these times. Carnegie was right when he said: "We shall be barbarians to our great-great-grandchildren."

After the battle of Martinique, Benjamin Franklin wrote his "Pest of Glory" as follows: "A young angel of distinction, being sent down to this world on some business for the first time, had an old courier spirit assigned him as a guide. They arrived over the sea of Martinico in the middle of the long day of an obstinate fight between the fleets of Rodney and de Grasse, when, through the clouds of smoke, he saw the fire of the guns, the decks covered with mangled limbs and bodies dead or dying, the ships sinking, burning, or blown into the air, and the quantity of pain, misery, and destruction. The crews yet alive were thus with so much eagerness dealing around to one another, he turned eagerly to his guide and said: 'You blundering blockhead, you, so ignorant of your business; you undertook to conduct me to Earth, and

you have brought me to Hell.' 'No, sir,' replied the guide, 'I have made no mistake. This is really the Earth, and these are men. Devils never treat each other in this cruel manner. They have more sense and more of what men call humanity.' "

—Peter Ainslie, The Church and International Peace, pp. 6, 7.

The largest increases have been in armaments. I pointed out that 1861 represented high-water mark at that date of the cost of armaments. Shortly afterward expenditure on the army and navy fell by something like £2,000,000 a year. It was then £28,285,000; it is now £74,544,000—an increase of £46,000,000. It was then growing at the rate of hundreds of thousands per year; it is now growing at the rate of millions a year. Since I have had the privilege of occupying my present office (chancellor of the exchequer), expenditure on armaments has grown by £15,000,000, and I see no prospect of this very menacing growth coming to an end unless there is some fundamental change in the attitude and policy of the nations of the earth.

The expenditure on armaments differs from every other expenditure in two respects. One is that it is non-productive. The other is that the increase or diminution in armaments is not dependent upon the will of the individual government that initiates the expenditure or even of the House of Commons that sanctions the expenditure—it depends upon the concerted or rather competitive will of a number of great nations, of whom we constitute one of the most potent. Now armaments count for the largest, and I think the most sterile, increase since 1861.

—David Lloyd George, Military Panics.

The exact disposition of the masses in relation to arma-

ments is shown by the increase in the number of opponents of militarism and preachers of the Socialist propaganda. In Germany in 1893, the opponents of the new military project received 1,097,000 votes more than its supporters. Between 1887 and 1893 the opposition against militarism increased more than seven times. In France the Socialist party in 1893 received 600,000 votes, and in 1896, 1,000,000.

—Bloch, The Future of War, Extract from p. 355.

Let us pity and forgive those who urge increased armaments, for "they know not what they do." "Preparation for war" by one nation invariably leads to "preparation against war" by the nations alarmed or endangered, and armies and navies find no limit to their expansion—as has been amply proven. "For what can war but endless war still breed?" asked Milton, poet and prophet, three centuries ago, and to this no answer has ever been or can be given! Let our motto, therefore, be "Preparation for World Peace," strong in the faith that under this holy banner there can be no such word as fail.

—Andrew Carnegie.

## CONSEQUENCES TO THE INDIVIDUAL SOLDIER AND TO THE COMMUNITY

Consider the influence of war on the character of those who make it their trade. They let themselves for slaughter, place themselves in the hands of rulers, to execute the bloodiest mandates. What a school is this for the human character! From men trained in battle to ferocity, accustomed to the perpetration of cruel deeds, accustomed to take human life without sorrow or remorse, habituated to esteem an unthinking courage a substitute for every virtue, encouraged by plunder to prodigality, taught improvidence by perpetual hazard and exposure, restrained only by an iron

discipline which is withdrawn in peace, and unfitted by the restless and irregular career of war for the calm and uniform pursuits of ordinary life; from such men what ought to be expected but contempt of human rights and of the laws of God? From the nature of his calling, the soldier is almost driven to sport with the thought of death, to defy and deride it, and, of course, to banish the thought of that retribution to which it leads; and though of all men the most exposed to sudden death, he is too often of all men the most unprepared to appear before his Judge.

The influence of war on the community at large, on its prosperity, its morals, and its political institutions, though less striking than on the soldiery, is yet baleful. How often is a community impoverished to sustain a war in which it has no interest? Public burdens are aggravated, while the means of sustaining them are reduced. Internal improvements are neglected. The revenue of the state is exhausted in military establishments, or flows through secret channels into the coffers of corrupt men, whom war exalts to power and office. The regular employments of peace are disturbed. Industry in many of its branches is suspended. . . .

The influence of war on the morals of society is also to be deprecated. The suspension of industry multiplies want, and criminal modes of subsistence are the resources of the suffering. Commerce, shackled and endangered, loses its upright and honorable character, and becomes a system of stratagem and collusion. In war the moral sentiments of a community are perverted by the admiration of military exploits. The milder virtues of Christianity are eclipsed by the baleful luster thrown round a ferocious courage. . . .

War especially injures the moral feelings of a people by making human nature cheap in their estimation, and human life of as little worth as that of an insect or a brute.

War diffuses through a community unfriendly and malig-

nant passions. Nations, exasperated by mutual injuries, burn for each other's humiliation and ruin. They delight to hear that famine, pestilence, want, defeat, and the most dreadful scourges which Providence sends on a guilty world are desolating a hostile community. The slaughter of thousands of fellow-beings, instead of awakening pity, flushes them with delirious joy, illuminates the city, and dissolves the whole country in revelry and riot. Thus the heart of man is hardened. . . .

War not only assails the prosperity and morals of a community; its influence on the political condition is threatening. It arms government with a dangerous patronage, multiplies dependents and instruments of oppression, and generates a power which, in the hands of the energetic and aspiring, endangers a free constitution. War organizes a body of men who lose the feelings of the citizen in the soldier; whose habits detach them from the community; whose ruling passion is devotion to a chief; who are inured in the camp to despotic sway; who are accustomed to accomplish their ends by force, and to sport with the rights and happiness of their fellow beings; who delight in tumult, adventure, and peril and turn with disgust and scorn from the quiet labors of peace.

—William Ellery Channing, Discourses on War, pp. 20-23.

Perhaps some have pondered over Sir John Sinclair's opinion that "the profession of a soldier is a damnable profession."

The professional soldier is primarily required for purposes of aggression, it being clear that if there were none to attack, none to defend would be needed. The volunteer, who arms only to be better able to defend his home and country, occupies a very different position from the recruit who enlists

unconditionally as a profession and binds himself to go forth and slay his fellows as directed. The defense of home and country may possibly become necessary. Still, the elements of patriotism and duty enter here. That it is every man's duty to defend home and country goes without saying. We should never forget, however, that which makes it a holy duty to defend one's home and country also makes it a holy duty not to invade the country and home of others, a truth which has not hitherto been kept in mind. The more's the pity, for in our time it is one incumbent upon the thoughtful peace-loving man to remember. The professional career is an affair of hire and salary. No duty calls any man to adopt the naval or military profession and engage to go forth to kill other men when and where ordered, without reference to the right or wrong of the quarrel. It is a serious engagement, involving as we lookers-on see it a complete surrender of the power most precious to man—the right of private judgment and appeal to conscience. Jay, the father of the first arbitration treaty between Britain and America, has not failed to point out that "our country, right or wrong, is rebellion against God and treason to the cause of civil and religious liberty, of justice and humanity."

—Andrew Carnegie, A League of Peace, pp. 45, 46.

The warlike nation of to-day is the decadent nation of to-morrow. It has ever been so, and in the nature of things it must ever be. —David Starr Jordan.

For what can war but endless war still breed?

—Milton.

Its destructive effect upon the moral character of the nation that wages it, is war's final condemnation.

—Walter Walsh.

War raises to the surface the worst passions and vices of men, and whoever expects soldiers, whether they be English, French, German, or Boers, to act in the heat of battle as a gentleman would act in a London drawing room, has very little knowledge of the ferocity latent in human nature. When life and death are the stakes for which men play, chivalry and mercy are easily forgotten, and the original savage reappears, not much changed from the primeval time.

—Ernest H. Crosby, War from the Christian Point of View, p. 4.

War is not the triumph of righteousness. It is the triumph of brute force. Can anything be conceived more unchristian, more irrational, than the present mode by which international quarrels are commonly adjusted?

—Bishop Fraser.

War suspends every idea of justice and humanity.

—Nechar.

**WAR DANGEROUS TO THE RACE**

War to the biologist seems, above all else, stupid. It is so racially dangerous. It so flies in the face of all that makes for human evolutionary advance, and is so utterly without shadow of serious scientific reason for its maintenance. It is not natural selection in man, nor in any way the counterpart of it. Its like does not exist in Nature outside the forays of the few degenerate fighting ant species, some of whom have lost the power of caring for their own young, and hence live as social parasites on less barbarous kinds, or have given up all other means of food getting than robbery by force of numbers. It is not only not natural selection, one that turns on itself, giving no advantage to the conqueror, but only many and terrible disadvantages to victor as well as to loser.

It does not encourage bravery, but directly and positively

robs the race of it. For it kills the brave and preserves the coward to breed his kind. Hiring willing men to fight, victualing them, transporting them, burying them, is not a stimulus or an exercise of personal hardihood or bravery or human virility. . . .

Its enormous evolutionary disadvantage to our species, especially in the present high and hence critical stage of our development, and our amazing hesitation to wipe it out—for it is only an element of controllable tradition, not of ineradicable dominating heredity—are matters that the biologist can hardly speak temperately about. We are a reasoning species, and one of a certain amount of self-control. Why not, then, reason as to war, and act on this reasoning?

—Vernon L. Kellogg, Beyond War, pp. 167-170.
(Henry Holt & Co., Publishers.)

One of the principal benefits attributed to war is that it operates for a selection favorable to the species. War, it is alleged, eliminates the degenerate races, assures the empire of the earth to vigorous, well-endowed races, and so constantly improves mankind.

There are few more egregious errors. It is easy to show that the selection resulting from war has *always* been the very reverse. It has invariably eliminated individuals physiologically the most perfect, and has allowed the weakest to survive. War has not hastened mankind's improvement, but retarded it. Improvement has taken place not as a result of, but in spite of, war.

Since the most ancient times men of the soundest constitutions, the most vigorous men, have gone off to fight. The weak, the sick, the deformed have remained at home. So, every battle carried away some of the select, leaving behind the socially unproductive. Besides, in the army itself there are brave men and cowards. The brave are certainly the

more perfect physiologically. Since they go to the front, more of them fall. Thus a second selection is added to the first to contribute to the elimination of the physically superior.

—J. Novicow, War and Its Alleged Benefits, Extracts from pp. 20, 21. (Henry Holt & Co., Publishers.)

## BATTLE CRY OF THE MOTHERS

Bone of our bone, flesh of our flesh,
Fruit of our age-long mother pain,
They have caught your life in the nations' mesh,
They have bargained you out for their paltry gain
And they build their hope on the shattered breast
Of the child we sang to rest.
On the shattered breast and the wounded cheek—
O, God! If the mothers could only speak!—
Blossom of centuries trampled down
For the moment's red renown.

Pulse of our pulse, breath of our breath,
Hope of the pang that brought to birth,
They have flung you forth to the fiends of death,
They have cast your flesh to the cruel earth,
Field upon field, tier upon tier
Till the darkness writhes in fear.
And they plan to marshal you more and more—
Oh, our minds are numb and our hearts are sore—
They are killing the thing we cherish most,
They are driving you forth in a blinding host,
They are storming the world with your eager strength—
But the judgment comes at length.

Emperors! Kings! On your heedless throne,
Do you hear the cry that the mothers make?
The blood you shed is our own, our own,
You shall answer, for our sake.
When you pierce his side, you have pierced our side—
O, mothers! The ages we have cried!—
And the shell that sunders his flesh apart
Enters our bleeding heart,

'Tis over our bodies you shout your way,
Our bodies that nourished him, day by day
In the long dim hours of our sacred bliss,
Fated to end in this!

Governors! Ministers! You who prate
That war and ravage and wreck must be
To save the nation, avenge the state,
To right men's wrongs and set them free—
You who have said
Blood must be shed
Nor reckoned the cost of our agony—
Answer us now! Down the ages long
*Who has righted the mother's wrong?*
You have bargained our milk, you have bargained our blood,
Nor counted us more than the forest brutes;
*By the shameful traffic of motherhood*
*Have you settled the world's disputes?*
Did you think to barter the perfect bloom,
Bodies shaped in our patient womb
And never to face the judgment day
When you and your kind should pay?

Flesh of our flesh, bone of our bone,
Hope of the pang we bore alone,
Sinew and strength of the midnight hour
When our dream had come to flower.

O, women! You who are spared our woe,
You who have felt the mother throe
Yet cannot know the stark despair
Of coffins you shall never bear—
Are you asleep that you do not care,
*Afraid*, that you do not dare?
Will you dumbly stand
In your own safe land
While our sons are slaughtered and torn?
Bravely through centuries we have borne
And suffered and wept in our secret place,
But now our silence and shame are past,
The reckoning day has come at last—
We must rise! We must plead for the race!

You who behold the mothers' plight,
Will you join our battle cry with might,
Will you fight the mothers' fight?
We who have given the soldiers birth,
Let us fling our cry to the ends of earth,
To the ends of Time let our voice be hurled
Till it waken the sleeping world.
Flesh of our flesh, bone of our bone,
Toil of the centuries come to speech,
As far as the human voice can reach
We will shout, we will plead for our own!

Warriors! Counselors! Men at arms!
You who have gloried in war's alarms,
When the great rebellion comes
You shall hear the beat
Of our marching feet
And the sound of our million drums.
You shall know that the world is at last awake—
You shall hear the cry that the mothers make—
*You shall yield—for the mothers' sake!*

—Angela Morgan.

## WAR RETARDS HUMAN PROGRESS

Commerce and war are obviously totally antithetic: The one mutually friendly intercourse; the other, unfriendly, murderous clashing. The one, an everworking instrument for building-up, for softening rancor, for spreading civilization and bringing nations together; the other, an instrument of destruction, engendering race hatred, retarding the progress of humanity.

The modern banker has ever been the counselor for the extension of commerce and all that that implies; actuated not by self-interest alone, but in the interest of the human race as a whole.

—Isaac N. Seligman, International Banking and Its Important Influence on International Unity, American Association for International Conciliation, 1912, p. 20.

War, conquest, and standing armaments cannot aid but only oppress trade.

—Richard Cobden.

It would be easy to prove by commercial statistics and historical reference the truth of the general statement made by John Ball Osborne in his essay on "The Influence of Commerce on the Promotion of International Peace," that "commerce is vitally dependent upon peace."

—Sereno S. Pratt, Contribution of Commercial Bodies to International Unity, American Association for International Conciliation, 1912, Extract from p. 5.

Man has ever overestimated the spoils of war, and tended to lose his sense of proportion in regard to their value. He has ever surrounded them with a glamour beyond their deserts. This is quite harmless when the booty is an enemy's sword hung over a household fire, or a battered flag decorating a city hall, but when the spoil of war is an idea which is bound on the forehead of the victor until it cramps his growth, a theory which he cherishes in his bosom until it grows so large and near that it afflicts its possessor with a sort of disease of responsibility for its preservation, it may easily overshadow the very people for whose cause the warrior issued forth.

Was this overestimation of the founders the cause of our subsequent failures? or rather did not the fault lie with their successors, and does it not now rest with us, that we have wrapped our inheritance in a napkin and refused to add thereto?

—Jane Addams, Newer Ideals of Peace, Extract from pp. 37, 38. (The Macmillan Co., Publishers.)

War is one of the principal causes of the degradation of the human race.—J. Novicow, War and Its Alleged Benefits. (Henry Holt & Co., Publishers.)

We dislike horrors, and we dislike the people who have a taste for them. The ugly facts in normal life we agree not to speak of. There grows up a feeling that to tell painful truths of any kind shows bad taste. Thus reform is neglected. I have for years felt the difficulty in regard to atrocious features incidental to Turkish government. Their recital might move the sympathetic to action; but we fear to incur the charge of bad form. The man who has seen war is in the same dilemma.

What is the distinction between horrors to tell and horrors to conceal? It lies surely in the difference between evils removable and irremovable. If war and neglect of wounds are a fixed quantity, the less said the better. Let us leave Zola's "La Débâcle" to the prurient and the idle. But, clearly, the diminution of pain in war has been one of the aims most unanimously pursued by modern Europe. Geneva Conventions and diplomacy itself have even dealt with the pain of injured horses. And now the whole question of the utility of war is on the table.

The problem is vital, and for its solution it is essential to know the facts. But how are we to know them? It is rare, and becoming rarer, that they are seen by any but the professional men employed and engrossed in the work. The lay onlooker is excluded more and more from military operations. The professional is debarred from writing. He is committed, also, quite naturally, to a partial and uncritical view. So much the more, I conclude, is the amateur, whose rare fortune it is to see war, bound to state the cold truth as he saw it, and leave his hearers to judge of it as they choose. . . .

The pathos and horror of the situation seemed all the more evident to the mind, because it has ceased to touch the feelings.

Here were human beings of a fine type, of pure blood, in the prime of life, remarkably free from immoral disease, of a courage and endurance that makes them renowned as fighters throughout Europe, with a quality of mind and body unique among the peasants of the world. As one worked on, the mind collected, with impartial coldness, the immense value of each of these creatures, beings to whom the expression "made in the image of God" might quite philosophically be applied.

And here, at closest quarters, by the insistent impact of sight and smell and hearing and touch, we realized this image smashed; its capacity for work, thought, fatherhood, happiness, destroyed by resultant ill-health; not one alone, such as would in peace time, in a case of misfortune, move a whole nation to sympathy, but by scores and hundreds and tens of thousands.

—M. A. Stobart, The Wounded, Extracts from pp. 1-9.

The Peace of Force demands that each and all shall be fully armed. Before it is the vision of universal discord, held in check by fear.

The Peace of Law looks forward to universal order. It has no need of force save as it may arise in the joint efforts of policing civilization.

—David Starr Jordan, War and Waste, Extract from p. 289.

## WAR RESULTS IN LOSS OF ENERGY

Humanity is a race of workers, and on its output of energy the well being of the planet now largely depends. The work

of the human race is directed toward (1) sustenance, (2) advancement; and on the whole the work is conducted at high pressure and there is little margin to spare. The more energy that has to be expended on mere existence the less is available for progress and development. Consequently it is in moderately fertile countries and peaceful times that the greatest steps in art and science have been made. When existence is threatened there is neither time nor opportunity for advance.

Humanity works in sections, and it is possible for these sections to quarrel and to seek to injure or destroy each other; thereby interfering with each other's bare subsistence, and taking attention off higher things. It is notorious that in such disputes much energy can be unprofitably consumed, or, more accurately, degraded; and also that even if there is no active quarrel between two sections, still the possibility of it entails severe preparation and anxiety and much unprofitable caution and disabling fear. So it used to be at one time between families, then between tribes, and now between nations; yet the sub-division of the race into nations, with differing facilities and a variety of customs and traditions, ought to have a beneficent influence as well as add greatly to the interest of life. So long as the sections cooperate and mutually help each other, all is well: each benefits by the discoveries and advances of the rest, and a valuable spirit of emulation is aroused. But when emulation degenerates from wholesome rivalry into a spirit of envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness, so that the sections wage an internecine conflict, then the warring among the members is a calamitous evil, and humanity as a whole is bound to suffer.

—Sir Oliver Lodge, The Irrationality of War, American Association for International Conciliation, 1912, pp. 5, 6.

## WAR BREAKS DOWN THE MORAL CODE

A declaration of war is the abrogation of morality—a license to kill, lie, covet, steal, and perform every sin which, up to the moment of the declaration, had been forbidden. The Decalogue is suspended. It is lawful to break all the commandments. Thou shalt not steal?—but the soldier may loot, and his country annex the conquered territory. The Sabbath shall be kept holy?—but the killing of enemies is not unholy on the holy day, and it becomes holy to march to divine worship to the blare of the trumpet and the skirl of the bagpipe, amid throngs of excited men and women. Everything goes. Nothing is left; neither God nor Sabbath, neither ethics nor religion. The military Moloch devours, not our children only, but our moral faculties, our sense of righteousness, our feeling of brotherhood, our religious vows. War is the sum of all villainies, and includes a corruption of moral sense that is the greatest of all its villainies. War kills, but the murderous spirit it creates is crueler than any particular act of murder. War lies; but the lying spirit it engenders is baser than any specific falsehood. War steals; but the pirate spirit it fosters is meaner than any single theft. War lusts; but the general debauchment of virtue is fouler than any one rape or violation. The glory of war is one thing; let it be put into the scale, and let the gain of war be put in with it. Then into the opposite scale let the moral damage of war be cast. Let the balance be true. Its destructive effect upon the moral character of the nation that wages it is war's final condemnation.

—Walter Walsh, The Moral Damage of War, Extracts from pp. 42, 43.

The difference between an immoral act and one that is merely inexpedient is that, while the latter admits of definition and qualification, the former admits only of direct con-

demnation. That which is expedient is permissible in degrees and under conditions to be ascertained; the immoral has only to be abandoned. The ethical admits of no modification: it is absolute. Hence it is that attempts to regulate war, being based on its expediency and permissibility, have been essential failures, and must continue to be so.

—Walter Walsh, Moral Damages of War, Extracts from pp. 28, 29.

The mere existence of the prophecy, "They shall learn war no more," is a sentence of condemnation on war.

—Chalmers.

War is nothing less than a temporary repeal of the principles of virtue.

—Robert Hall.

God is forgotten in war; every principle of Christianity is trampled upon.

—Sydney Smith.

Let the lower motives essay the diminution of war, and demonstrate their inability to bring bloodshed to an end; but let religion continue to urge forward that absolute ethics which has power in it to bring both public and private affairs into the same moral category and make them keep step to the music of man's evolving spiritual consciousness. "They who defend war," says Erasmus, "must defend the dispositions which lead to war, and these dispositions are absolutely forbidden by the gospel." This the Lollards clearly perceived (like many others before them) when they petitioned the parliament of their day "that war might be declared unchristian." But since the gospel forbids the disposition which makes war, it forbids war; and war is therefore irreli-

gious, war is immoral, war is sin. If we reject the decisions of our developed moral nature, which of our gods of expediency, or rationality, or utility, will save us?

—WALTER WALSH, Moral Damages of War, Extracts from p. 36.

I found Him in the shining of the stars,
I mark'd Him in the flowering of His fields,
But in His ways with men I find Him not.
I waged His wars, and now I passed and die.
O me! for why is all around us here
As if some lesser god had made the world,
But had not force to shape it as he would,
Till the High God behold it from beyond,
And enter it, and make it beautiful?
Or else as if the world were wholly fair,
And that these eyes of men are dense and dim,
And have not power to see it as it is:
Perchance, because we see not to the close;—
For I, being simple, thought to work His will,
And have but stricken with the sword in vain;
And all whereon I lean'd in wife and friend
Is traitor to my peace, and all my realm
Reels back into the beast, and is no more.
My God, thou hast forgotten me in my death:
Nay—God my Christ—I pass but shall not die.

—TENNYSON.

"The Passing of Arthur" may be interpreted as an expression of the fact that empire—even benevolent empire—based on force and built up by the sword—even a reforming sword—is nothing but an instrument of spoliation to the wicked and heartbreak to the good, thus far voicing a grave warning to all empire builders: may be read, further, as a parable of the modern reformer's disillusionment, since he, being simple, thought to work His will in peaceful ways, but finds all he leaned on in state and church, even in wife and friend,

traitor to his peace, while all his laboriously built up projects reel back into the beast, and are no more: yet, finally, embodies a grand prophecy of ultimate triumph, immortal hope, and eternal life, since all great purposes and noble reforms pass, but cannot die.

—Walter Walsh, Moral Damage of War, Extracts from pp. 412, 413.

## WAR A MEANS, NOT AN END

A German author, Max Jahns, in a work ardently apologizing for war, says: "War regenerates corrupt peoples, it awakens dormant nations, it rouses self-forgetful, self-abandoned races from their mortal languor. In all times war has been an essential factor in civilization. It has exercised a happy influence upon customs, arts, and science." Some French authors hold the same views. At bottom, G. Valbert agrees with Max Jahns, and the great Ernst Renan says somewhere: "Let us cling with love to our custom of fighting from time to time because war is the necessary occasion and place for manifesting moral force."

Another writer, Dr. LeBon, says: "One of the chief conditions for the upliftment of an enfeebled nation is the organization of a very strong military force. It must always hold up the threat of a disastrous war."

According to these authors, war has beneficial results. If war should be suppressed, those benefits would likewise disappear. War, then, is an end in itself.

Now, here we have the great fundamental error from which innumerable other fallacies logically proceed. War never has been an end, whether for animals or man. Since living beings have peopled our sphere, they have killed one another without cease, every hour, every minute, every second. But massacre has always been a means, not an end.

Since the remotest periods men went to war only with some particular object in view. The goal striven for by every human being is enjoyment. . . .

War is carried on from one of the following motives: to kill one's fellow-men for the sake of using them as food; to deprive them of their women; to obtain booty from them; to impose a religion, certain ideas, or a type of culture upon them. . . .

The object of war has been in turn, cannibalism, spoliation, intolerance, and despotism; none of which have ever been held to be beneficial. Then, how the means by which those objects have been attained, that is, war, can be beneficial, is an incomprehensible mystery.

As we now see, all we need do is to abandon nebulous metaphysics and take our stand for an instant on the ground of concrete realities to see all the alleged benefits of war vanish away like smoke.

War might be an end in itself, it might produce results favorable to mankind, but that only if suffering and death were enjoyable. And everybody knows that they are not.

—J. Novicow, War and Its Alleged Benefits, Extracts from pp. 1-6. (Henry Holt & Co., Publishers.)

## THE WARLIKE NATION THE DECADENT NATION

Not long ago I visited the town of Novara, in northern Italy. There, in a wheat-field, the farmers have plowed up skulls of men till they have piled up a pyramid ten or twelve feet high. Over this pyramid some one has built a canopy to keep off the rain. These were the skulls of young men of Savoy, Sardinia, and Austria—men of eighteen to thirty-five years of age, without physical blemish so far as may be —peasants from the farms and workmen from the shops, who met at Novara to kill each other over a matter in which

they had very little concern. Should the Prince of Savoy sit on his unstable throne or yield it to some one else, this was the question. It matters not the decision. History doubtless records it, as she does many matters of less moment. But this fact concerns us—here in thousands they died. Farther on, Frenchmen, Austrians, and Italians fell together at Magenta, in the same cause. You know the color that we call Magenta, the hue of the blood that flowed out under the olive trees. Go over Italy as you will, there is scarcely a spot not crimsoned by the blood of France, scarcely a railway station without its pile of French skulls. You can trace them across to Egypt, to the foot of the Pyramids. You will find them in Germany—at Jena and Leipzig, at Lutzen and Bautzen and Austerlitz. You will find them in Russia, at Moscow; in Belgium at Waterloo. "A boy can stop a bullet as well as a man," said Napoleon; and with the rest are the skulls and bones of boys, "ere evening to be trodden like the grass." "Born to be food for powder" was the grim epigram of the day, summing up the life of the French peasant. Read the dreary record of the glory of France, the slaughter at Waterloo, the wretched failure of Moscow, the miserable slaughter of Sedan, the waste of Algiers, the poison of Madagascar, the crimes of Indo-China, the hideous results of barrack vice and its entail of disease and sterility, and you will understand the "Man of the Hoe." The man who is left, the man whom glory cannot use, becomes the father of the future men of France. As the long-horn cattle reappear in a neglected or abused herd of Durhams, so comes forth the aboriginal man, the "Man of the Hoe," in a wasted race of men. . . .

"The Roman Empire," says Seeley, "perished for want of men." You will find this fact on the pages of every history, though few have pointed out war as the final and necessary cause of the Roman downfall. . . .

The warlike nation of to-day is the decadent nation of to-morrow. It has ever been so, and in the nature of things it must ever be.

In his charming studies of "Feudal and Modern Japan," Mr. Arthur Knapp returns again and again to the great marvel of Japan's military prowess after more than two hundred years of peace. It is astonishing to him that, after more than six generations in which physical courage has not been demanded, these virile virtues should be found unimpaired. We can readily see that this is just what we should expect. In times of peace there is no slaughter of the strong, no sacrifice of the courageous. In the peaceful struggle for existence there is a premium placed on these virtues. The virile and the brave survive. The idle, weak, and dissipated go to the wall. If after two hundred years of incessant battle Japan still remained virile and warlike, that would indeed be the marvel. But that marvel no nation has ever seen. It is doubtless true that warlike traditions are most persistent with nations most frequently engaged in war. But the tradition of war and the physical strength to gain victories are very different things. Other things being equal the nation which has known least of war is the one most likely to develop the "strong battalions" with whom victory must rest. . . . If war is good, we should have it regardless of its cost, regardless of its horrors, its sorrows, its anguish, havoc, and waste.

But it is bad, only to be justified as the last resort of "mangled, murdered liberty," a terrible agency to be evoked only when all other arts of self-defense shall fail. The remedy for most ills of men is not to be sought in "whirlwinds of rebellion that shake the world," but in peace and justice, equality among men, and the cultivation of those virtues we call Christian, because they have been virtues ever since man and society began, and will be virtues still when

the era of strife is past and the "redcoat bully in his boots" no longer "hides the march of man from us."

It is the voice of political wisdom which falls from the bells of Christmas-tide: "Peace on earth, good will towards men!"

—David Starr Jordan, The Blood of the Nation, pp. 45-47, 52, 62, 64, 81-82.

## UNNATURAL AND IRRATIONAL SELECTION THROUGH WAR

There is another effect of war which is less obvious but more important. During a period of peace, rest, and routine, powers are developed which are in reality societal variations, among which a certain societal selection should take place. Here comes the immense benefit of real liberty, because, if there is real liberty, a natural selection results; but if there is social prejudice, monopoly, privilege, orthodoxy, tradition, popular delusion, or any other restraint on liberty, selection does not occur. War operates a rude and imperfect selection. Our Civil War may serve as an example; think of the public men who were set aside by it, and compare them in character and ideas. Think of the doctrines which were set aside as false, and of the others which were established as true; also of the constitutional principles which were permanently stamped as heretical or orthodox. As a simple example, compare the position and authority of the President of the United States as it was before and as it has been since the Civil War. The Germans tell of the ruthless and cruel acts of Napoleon in Germany, and all that they say is true; but he did greater services to Germany than any other man who can be mentioned. He tore down the relics of mediævalism and set the powers of the nation to some extent free from the fetters of tradition; we do not see what else could have

done it. It took another war in 1870 to root out the traditional institutions and make way for the new ones. Of course the whole national life responded to this selection. The Roman state was a selfish and pitiless subjugation of all the rest of mankind. It was built on slavery, it cost inconceivable blood and tears, and it was a grand system of extortion and plunder, but it gave security and peace under which the productive powers of the provinces expanded and grew. The Roman state gave discipline and organization and it devised institutions; the modern world has inherited societal elements from it which are invaluable. One of the silliest enthusiasms which ever got control of the minds of a great body of men was the Crusades, but the Crusades initiated a breaking up of the stagnation of the Dark Ages and an emancipation of the social forces of Europe. They exerted a selective effect to destroy what was barbaric and deadening and to foster what had new hope in it by furnishing a stimulus to thought and knowledge.

A society needs to have a ferment in it; sometimes an enthusiastic delusion or an adventurous folly answers the purpose. In the modern world the ferment is furnished by economic opportunity and hope of luxury. In other ages it has often been furnished by war. Therefore some social philosophers have maintained that the best course of human affairs is an alternation of peace and war. . . .

We find that in the past as a matter of fact war has played a great part in the irrational nature-process by which things have come to pass. But the nature-processes are frightful; they contain no allowance for the feelings and interests of individuals—for it is only individuals who have feelings and interests. The nature-elements never suffer and they never pity. If we are terrified at the nature-processes there is only one way to escape them; it is the way by which men have always evaded them to some extent; it is by knowledge, by

rational methods, and by the arts. The facts which have been presented about the functions of war in the past are not flattering to the human reason or conscience. They seem to show that we are as much indebted for our welfare to base passion as to noble and intelligent endeavor. At the present moment things do not look much better. We talk of civilizing lower races, but we never have done it yet; we have exterminated them. Our devices for civilizing nations are making haste, in the utmost jealousy of each other, to seize upon all the outlying parts of the globe; they are vying with each other in the construction of navies by which each may defend its share against the others. What will happen? As they are preparing for war they certainly will have war, and their methods of colonization and exploitation will destroy the aborigines. In this way the human race will be civilized—but by the extermination of the uncivilized—unless the men of the twentieth century can devise plans for dealing with aborigines which are better than any which have yet been devised. No one has yet found any way in which two races, far apart in blood and culture, can be amalgamated into one society with satisfaction to both. Plainly, in this matter which lies in the immediate future, the only alternatives to force and bloodshed are more knowledge and more reason.

Shall any statesman, therefore, ever dare to say that it would be well, at a given moment, to have war, lest the nation fall into the vices of industrialism and the evils of peace? The answer is plainly: No! War is never a handy remedy, which can be taken up and applied by routine rule. No war which can be avoided is just to the people who have to carry it on, to say nothing of the enemy. War is like other evils; it must be met when it is unavoidable, and such gain as can be got from it must be won. In the forum of reason and deliberation war never can be anything but a makeshift, to be

regretted; the statesman who proposes war as an instrumentality admits his incompetency; a politician who makes use of war as a counter in the game of parties is a criminal. . . .

There is no state of readiness for war; the notion calls for never-ending sacrifices. It is a fallacy. It is evident that to pursue such a notion with any idea of realizing it would absorb all the resources and activity of the state; this the great European states are now proving by experiment. A wiser rule would be to make up your mind soberly what you want, peace or war, and then to get ready for what you want; for what we prepare for is what we shall get.

—William Graham Sumner, War and Other Essays, pp. 32-40. (Copyright, 1911, by Yale University Press.)

## CHAPTER V

## THE MORAL EQUIVALENTS OF WAR

Peace has her banners and her bugle calls,
And Truth and Justice their great battle cries.
Greed is entrenched within his bastioned walls,
Where helpless Honor bound and bleeding dies.
The social lies still leer on every side,
Herod still mocks where Christ was crucified.

Listen! To-day, as in the days of yore,
The clarion call of Duty, peal on peal!
Rally! Form ranks! The foe lies just before.
Unfurl the banners! Bare the shining steel!
Charge as your fathers charged, and prove your claim
To share their honors and to bear their name.

—Dr Edward J. Wheeler.

### CHANGING IDEALS

Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide,
In the strife of Truth with Falsehood, for the good or evil side; . . .
Hast thou chosen, O my people, in whose party thou shalt stand,
Ere the doom from its worn sandals shakes the dust against our land? . . .
Careless seems the great Avenger; history's page but records
One death-grapple in the darkness 'twixt old systems and the Word; . . .
We see dimly in the Present what is small and what is great,
Slow of faith, how weak an arm may turn the iron helm of fate,
But the soul is still oracular; amid the market's din,
List the ominous stern whisper from the Delphic cave within—

"They enslave their children's children who make compromise with sin" . . .
New occasions teach new duties; Time makes ancient good uncouth;
They must upward still, and onward, who would keep abreast of Truth;
Lo, before us gleam her camp-fires! we ourselves must Pilgrims be,
Launch our Mayflower, and steer boldly through the desperate winter sea,
Nor attempt the Future's portal with the Past's blood-rusted key.

—James Russell Lowell.

At the present moment the war spirit attempts to justify its noisy demonstrations by quoting its great achievements in the past and by drawing attention to the courageous life which it has evoked and fostered. It is, however, perhaps significant that the adherents of war are more and more justifying it by its past record and reminding us of its ancient origin. They tell us that it is interwoven with every fiber of human growth and is at the root of all that is noble and courageous in human life, that struggle is the basis of all progress, that it is now extended from individuals and tribes to nations and races.

We may admire much that is admirable in this past life of courageous warfare, while at the same time we accord it no right to dominate the present, which has traveled out of its reach into a land of new desires. We may admit that the experiences of war have equipped the men of the present with pluck and energy, but to insist upon the selfsame expression for that pluck and energy would be as stupid a mistake as if we should relegate the full-grown citizen, responding to many claims and demands upon his powers, to the school-yard fights of his boyhood, or to the college contests of his cruder youth. The little lad who stoutly defends himself on the schoolground may be worthy of much admiration,

but if we find him, a dozen years later, the bullying leader of a street-gang who bases his prestige on the fact that "no one can whip him," our admiration cools amazingly, and we say that the carrying over of those puerile instincts into manhood shows arrested development which is mainly responsible for filling our prisons.

This confusion between the contemporaneous stage of development and the historic rôle of certain qualities, is intensified by our custom of referring to social evolution as if it were a force and not a process. We assume that social ends may be obtained without the application of social energies, although we know in our hearts that the best results of civilization have come about only through human will and effort. To point to the achievement of the past as a guarantee for continuing what has since become shocking to us is stupid business; it is to forget that progress itself depends upon adaptation, upon a nice balance between continuity and change. Let us by all means acknowledge and preserve that which has been good in warfare and in the spirit of warfare; let us gather it together and incorporate it in our national fiber. Let us, however, not be guilty for a moment of shutting our eyes to that which for many centuries must have been disquieting to the moral sense, but which is gradually becoming impossible, not only because of our increasing sensibilities, but because great constructive plans and humanized interests have captured our hopes and we are finding that war is an implement too clumsy and barbaric to subserve our purpose. We have come to realize that the great task of pushing forward social justice could be enormously accelerated if primitive methods as well as primitive weapons were once for all abolished.

The past may have been involved in war and suffering in order to bring forth a new and beneficent courage, an invincible ardor for conserving and healing human life, for

understanding and elaborating it. To obtain this courage is to distinguish between a social order founded upon law enforced by authority and that other social order which includes liberty of individual action and complexity of group development.

—Jane Addams, Newer Ideals of Peace, pp. 210-213. (The Macmillan Company, Publishers.)

The same motives which have dispelled the combative ideal from all but the lowest individuals will also prevail over the minds of nations. As the joy of mere fighting could not, in the mass of men, compete with the more substantial satisfaction of success in artisanship, agriculture, medicine, architecture and trade, and the man who was eager for rewards of this type consented to forego the respect which comes of being a dangerous shot or swordsman, ready for the instant's quarrel; so the state will increasingly feel the attractive ends from which it is excluded by the effort at constant readiness for war. Every fresh opportunity for truly fruitful action by government tends to produce coolness toward the warrior-ideal. Men become jealous of the enormous expense for military purposes when once they clearly see the definite benefits they lose because the needed money goes to purposes of war.

We judge men by the ratio of their accomplishments to their opportunities. And so it must be with nations. As we gradually learn that the will and intelligence of the nation can do even more eminently than any single individual the work of fighting disease and ignorance and vice; that indeed only the united people can to-day insure free communication and just commerce; that the growth and application of science increases vastly by public support; when there are all these opportunities for national effort, men will not be content to approve a government whose main effort is

merely to be prepared for attack from without. Swagger and sword-clanking and parade of "honor" will no longer satisfy the newer measure of worth; they no longer seem the prime use of so high and effective an instrument as the national power.

—GEORGE M. STRATTON, The Double Standard in Regard to Fighting, pp. 11, 12, in Documents of the American Association for International Conciliation, 1912.

And soon we shall have thinkers in the place of fighters
. . . . . .
What ye want is light—indeed
. . . . . .
God's light organized
In some high soul, crowned capable to lead
The conscious people, conscious and advised—
For if we lift a people like mere clay,
It falls the same. We want thee, O unfound
And sovran teacher! if thy beard be gray
Or black, we bid thee rise up from the ground
And speak the word God giveth thee to say,
Inspiring into all these people round,
Instead of passion, thought which pioneers
All generous passion, purifies from sin,
And strikes the hour for. Rise up, teacher! here's
A crowd to make a nation!—best begin
By making each a man, till all be peers
Of earth's true patriots and pure martyrs in
Knowing and daring.

—ELIZABETH BARRETT BROWNING, Casa Guidi Windows, Pt. I.

### A NEW HEROISM

While in the popular mind the old hero worship holds its place with wonderful persistence, there are many things to indicate that it is growing confused and no longer infallibly follows the old ideals. The stoker in the hold of a battleship runs as much risk as the admiral on the deck, and his services

are an indispensable factor in the result achieved. The men in the ranks run vastly greater risks than the general in the rear, who plans the whole movement of battle. It is not an essential, therefore, that the hero exhibit great personal daring or prowess; so that even now a higher value is set upon intelligence than upon mere physical courage. It ought to be an easy step to the appreciation of that intelligence which is directed to altogether useful and beneficent ends, such as its relative importance demands.

From what has been said it ought to be clear that heroism as embodied in the traditional sense and popular ideal is already archaic. The unreasoning, instinctive, brute courage, ready to fight without cause and without caution, is no longer a useful quality. Even in war it has lost its value. What is wanted now is coolness, endurance, patience, steadiness. There is little field for the old spectacular fighting of man against man. . . . We shall make, however, a great mistake if we allow ourselves to undervalue physical courage. It will always be a necessity in the life of man. Situations will always arise where men must face danger, taking their lives, as it were, in their hands; but the application of courage in the old methods and to the old ends is becoming year by year obsolete. . . .

Reason in a larger sense, a truer and wider perception of the relations of things, a better understanding of the utilities and capacities of nature, is taking possession of man, and receiving that admiration which has in turn been bestowed upon physical courage, cunning, and moral virtues.

—H. E. Warner, The Ethics of Force, Extracts from pp. 35, 36.

## A PROGRESSIVE ATTITUDE

We are living under the government of Almighty God. One of the fundamental principles of that government is

progress. Accordingly, what may have been relatively right in the past may be absolutely wrong in the future. For we must distinguish between absolute truth, or truth as it exists unconditionally in the infinite mind, and relative truth, or truth as it appears to our finite minds, now under this set of conditions, now under that set. In other words, God, in revealing himself to men, has been pleased to use the law of adaptation; or, as the philosophers say, "the law of economy of action."

—George Dana Boardman, Relation of Nationalism to Internationalism, in Report of The Fifth Universal Peace Congress, p. 221.

To do the soldiers justice, they very rarely raise this plea of war being a moral training school. "War itself," said on one occasion an officer, "is an infernally dirty business. But somebody has got to do the dirty work of the world, and I am glad to think that it is the business of the soldier to prevent rather than make war."

Not that I am concerned to deny that we owe a great deal to the soldier. I do not know even why we should deny that we owe a great deal to the Viking. Neither the one nor the other was in every aspect despicable. Both have bequeathed a heritage of courage, sturdiness, hardihood, and rough discipline—all this and much more. It is not true to say of any emotion that it is wholly and absolutely good or wholly and absolutely bad. The same psychological force which made the Vikings destructive and cruel pillagers made their descendants sturdy and resolute pioneers and colonists; and the same emotional force which turns so much of Africa into a sordid and bloody shambles would, with a different direction and distribution, turn it into a garden. Is it for nothing that the splendid Scandinavian race, who have converted their rugged and rock-strewn peninsula into a group of pros-

perous and stable States, which are an example to Europe, and have infused the great Anglo-Saxon stock with something of their sane but noble idealism have the blood of Vikings in their veins? Is there no place for the free play of all the best qualities of the Viking and the soldier in a world still so sadly in need of men with courage enough, for instance, to face the truth, however difficult it may seem, however unkind to our pet prejudices?

There is not the least necessity for the peace advocate to ignore facts in this matter. The race of man loves a soldier just as boys we used to love the pirate, and many of us, perhaps to our very great advantage, remain in part boys our lives through. But just as growing out of boyhood we regretfully discover the sad fact that we cannot be a pirate, that we cannot even hunt Indians, nor be a scout, not even a trapper, so surely the time has come to realize that we have grown out of soldiering. The romantic appeal of war was just as true of the ventures of the old Vikings, and even later of piracy. Yet we superseded the Viking and we hanged the pirate, though I doubt not we loved him while we hanged him; and I am not aware that those who urged the suppression of piracy were vilified (except by the pirates) as maudlin sentimentalists who ignored human nature, or, as Mr. Lea's phrase has it, as "half-educated, sick-brained visionaries, denying the inexorability of the primordial law of struggle." Piracy interfered seriously with the trade and industry of those who desired to earn for themselves as good a living as they could get, and to obtain from this imperfect world all that it had to offer. Piracy was magnificent, doubtless, but it was not business. We are prepared to sing about the Viking, but not to tolerate him on the high seas; and those of us who are quite prepared to give the soldier his due place in poetry and legend and romance, quite prepared to admit, with Mr. Roosevelt and Von Moltke and the rest, the qualities

which perhaps we owe to him, and without which we should be poor folk indeed, are nevertheless inquiring whether the time has not come to place him (or a good portion of him) gently on the poetic shelf with the Viking; or at least to find other field for those activities, which, however much we may be attracted by them, have in their present form little place in a world in which, as Bacon has said, though men love danger better than travail, travail is bound, alas!—despite ourselves, and whether we fight Germany or not, and whether we win or lose—to be our lot.

—Norman Angell, The Great Illusion, p. 291.
(G. P. Putnam's Sons, Publishers.)

## THE BATTLE ON HIGHER GROUND

There is nothing good or glorious which war has brought forth in human nature which peace may not produce more richly and more permanently. When we cease to think of peace as the negative of war, and think of war as the negative of peace, making war, and not peace, the exception and interruption of human life, making peace, and not war, the type and glory of existence, then shall shine forth the higher soldiership of the higher battles. Then the first military spirit and its works shall seem to be but crude struggles after, and rehearsals for, that higher fight, the fight after the eternal facts and their obedience, the fight against the perpetually intrusive lie, which is the richer glory of the riper man. The facts of government, the facts of commerce, the facts of society, the facts of history, the facts of man, the facts of God, in these, in the perception of their glory, in the obedience to their compulsion, shall be the possibility and promise of the soldier statesman, the soldier scientist, the soldier philanthropist, the soldier priest, the soldier man. "The sword is beaten into the ploughshare, the spear into the pruning-hook." "The war-drum throbs no longer, and the

battle flags are furled." But it is not that the power of fight has perished: it is that the battle has gone up on to higher ground, and into higher light. The battle is above the clouds.

—From PHILLIPS BROOKS' Sermon before the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company of Boston.

**LIVING FOR COUNTRY**

Spend the money you waste on armaments in destroying slums and gin-palaces; create healthy places of amusement—counter attractions to vice; take the country into the town and the townsfolk into the country. In other words, let nations so govern themselves that all their citizens shall have free scope for development. Then there will be plenty to do at home without going to war abroad. Then it will be a sweet and glorious thing to *live* for one's country. Living patriotism will be so busy that dying patriotism, which is after all only work for the unemployed, will not be called for.

—FRANCIS W. HIRST, The Arbiter in Council, p. 567.

I have given four years of my life to leading the youths of Virginia to battle and to death. I want to give the remaining years of my life to teaching the youths of Virginia how to live.

—ROBERT E. LEE, in Report of The Fourth American Peace Congress, p. 301.

The partisans of war urge four capital reasons in behalf of their principle: personal glory, moral education, class interest, and national egoism. . . .

To balance these, the advocates of peace plead four greater considerations: against personal glory, the economic cost of militarism; against the moral education of war, the higher heroism of peace; against class interests, the sanctity of

human life; and against national egoism, the deeper spirit of national altruism.

—Paul Smith, The Conflict of War and Peace in Prize Orations of the Intercollegiate Peace Association, Extracts from pp. 27-29.

**HEROIC LIVING**

"'Twas said: 'When roll of drum and battle's roar
Shall cease upon the earth, O, then no more

"'The deed, the race, of heroes in the land.'
But scarce that word was breathed when one small hand

"Lifted victorious o'er a giant wrong
That had its victims crushed through ages long;

"Some woman set her pale and quivering face,
Firm as a rock, against a man's disgrace;

"A little child suffered in silence lest
His savage pain should wound a mother's breast;

"Some quiet scholar flung his gauntlet down
And risked, in Truth's great name, the synod's frown;

"A civic hero, in the calm realm of laws,
Did that which suddenly drew a world's applause;

"And one to the pest his lithe young body gave
That he a thousand, thousand lives might save."

—Richard Watson Gilder.

War does not create bravery, it only reveals it as existing. Heroism exists and would exist if there were no war, but heroism would find a nobler and more congenial sphere in which to exercise itself. Heroism would be employed in the arts of peace. Heroism would go to Africa to find Livingstone. Yea, it would be Livingstone. Was not Robert Moffat a hero? Yet he carried no sword but the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God. Was not Father Damien a hero? Was not Bishop Pattison a hero? Is not Duncan of Metlakhatla a hero? Were not those American theological students

of heroic fiber—those, I mean, who, when visited by a missionary from the Southern Seas, whose brethren in that mission field had been killed and eaten—rose in their class, and, with full knowledge of the dread possibilities before them, by a large majority said, "Here am I, take me." Heroism! There is as much heroism on the mission field as on the battlefield. The mission field is the true battlefield of the world. It demands more heroism to plod on in the teeth of all but insuperable difficulties, often alone and unaided, than to fight at Sedan or Gettysburg or Waterloo. There is as much heroism in human nature to-day as ever there was. It is too rare and valuable an article for heartless politicians to waste on battlefields. We may turn it in the direction of destruction, or in the direction of instruction and construction. We may use it to save men's lives or to destroy them. . . .

—Reuen Thomas, The War System.

We meet in a famous hall [the Royal Gallery of the House of Lords], and looking down upon us from these walls are pictures that illustrate not only the glory that is to be won in war, but the horrors that follow war. There is a picture of one of the great figures in English history [pointing to the fresco, by Maclise, of the death of Nelson]. Lord Nelson is represented as dying, and around him are the mangled forms of others. I understand that war brings out certain virtues. I am aware that it gives opportunity for the display of great patriotism. I am aware that the example of men who give their lives for their country is inspiring. But I venture to say there is as much inspiration in a noble life as there is in an heroic death, and I trust that one of the results of this Interparliamentary Union will be to emphasize the doctrine that a life devoted to the public, overflowing, like a spring, with good, exerts an influence upon the human race and upon the destiny of the world as great as any death in war. And

if you will permit me to mention one whose career I watched with interest and whose name I revere, I will say that, in my humble judgment, the sixty-four years of spotless public service of William Ewart Gladstone will, in years to come, be regarded as rich an ornament to the history of this nation as the life of any man who poured out his blood upon the battlefield.

—William J. Bryan.

The patriot of the future will be the man who lives for his country, as well as dies for it, and he who dies in her service while *saving* life will be a greater patriot than he who dies for her while destroying other lives. The hero of the future will be of the industrial, professional, and laboring world, not of the battlefield, except as he may defend his country from wanton attack. (The United States will never be attacked if true patriotism prevails and makes her just and honorable.) The hero fund, whose awards are always to go to those who save life, never to those who take it, is not only a premonition of the new patriotism, but has wonderfully helped its coming by directing the attention of the world from the battlefield to the civic and industrial sphere as the true field of bravery. Not insignificant is it that at a recent vote taken in the Paris schools on France's greatest hero, the vote which twenty years ago would have put Napoleon, who took over three million lives, at the head of the list, placed him far down the list, and hailed Pasteur as the true patriot of France.

—Frederick Lynch, What Makes a Nation Great,
Extracts from pp. 47, 48.

Peace, too, has its own peculiar victories, in comparison with which Marathon and Bannockburn and Bunker Hill, fields sacred in the history of human freedom, lose their

luster. Our own Washington rises to a truly heavenly stature, not when we follow him through the ice of the Delaware to the capture of Trenton, not when we behold him victorious over Cornwallis at Yorktown, but when we regard him, in noble deference to Justice, refusing the kingly crown which a faithless soldiery proffered, and at a later day upholding the peaceful neutrality of the country, while he met unmoved the clamor of the people wickedly crying for War. What glory of battle in England's annals will not fade by the side of that great act of justice, when her Parliament, at a cost of one hundred million dollars, gave freedom to eight hundred thousand slaves? And when the day shall come (may these eyes be gladdened by its beam!) that shall witness an act of larger justice still—the peaceful emancipation of three million fellow-men "guilty of a skin not colored as our own," now, in this land of jubilant freedom, bound in gloomy bondage—then will there be a victory by the side of which that of Bunker Hill will be as the farthing candle held up to the sun. That victory will need no monument of stone. It will be written on the grateful hearts of countless multitudes that shall proclaim it to the latest generation. It will be one of the famed landmarks of civilization—or, better still, a link in the golden chain by which Humanity connects itself with the throne of God.

As man is higher than the beasts of the field, as the angels are higher than man, as Christ is higher than Mars, as he that ruleth his spirit is higher than he that taketh a city—so are the victories of Peace higher than the victories of War.

—Charles Sumner, Addresses on War, Extract from pp. 127, 128.

## SUBSTITUTES FOR MILITARY VIRTUES

We come to the practical question as to how these substi-

tutes for the war virtues may be found. How may we, the children of an industrial and commercial age, find the courage and sacrifice which belong to our industrialism? We may begin with August Comte's assertion that man seeks to improve his position in two different ways, by the destruction of obstacles and by the construction of means, or, designated by their most obvious social results, if his contention is correct, by military action and by industrial action, and that the two must long continue side by side. Then we find ourselves asking what may be done to make more picturesque those lives which are spent in a monotonous and wearing toil, compared to which the camp is exciting and barracks comfortable. How shall it be made to seem as magnificent patiently to correct the wrongs of industrialism as to do battle for the rights of the nation? This transition ought not to be so difficult in America, for to begin with, our national life in America has been largely founded upon our success in invention and engineering, in manufacturing and commerce. Our prosperity has rested upon constructive labor and material progress, both of them in striking contrast to warfare. There is an element of almost grim humor in the nation's reverting at last to the outworn methods of battleships and defended harbors. We may admit that idle men need war to keep alive their courage and endurance, but we have few idle men in a nation engaged in industrialism. We constantly see subordination of sensation to sentiment in hundreds of careers which are not military; the thousands of miners in Pennsylvania doubtless endure every year more bodily pain and peril than the same number of men in European barracks.

Industrial life affords ample opportunity for endurance, discipline, and a sense of detachment, if the struggle is really put upon the highest level of industrial efficiency. But because our industrial life is not on this level, we constantly

tend to drop the newer and less developed ideals for the older ones of warfare, we ignore the fact that war so readily throws back the ideals which the young are nourishing into the mold of those which the old should be outgrowing. It lures young men not to develop, but to exploit; it turns them from the courage and toil of industry to the bravery and endurance of war, and leads them to forget that civilization is the substitution of law for war. It incites their ambitions, not to irrigate, to make fertile and sanitary, the barren plain of the savage, but to fill it with military posts and tax-gatherers, to cease from pushing forward industrial action into new fields and to fall back upon military action. . . .

It is really human constructive labor which must give the newly invaded country a sense of its place in the life of the civilized world, some idea of the effective occupations which it may perform. In order to accomplish this its energy must be freed and its resources developed. Militarism undertakes to set in order, to suppress and to govern, if necessary to destroy, while industrialism undertakes to liberate latent forces, to reconcile them to new conditions, to demonstrate that their aroused activities can no longer follow caprice, but must fit into a larger order of life. To call this latter undertaking, demanding ever new powers of insight, patience, and fortitude, less difficult, less manly, less strenuous, than the first, is on the face of it absurd. It is the soldier who is inadequate to the difficult task, who strews his ways with blunders and lost opportunities, who cannot justify his vocation by the results, and who is obliged to plead guilty to a lack of rational method.

—Jane Addams, Newer Ideals of Peace, Extracts from pp. 217-221. (The Macmillan Co., Publishers.)

When Friday tried to indulge his cannibalism, Robinson Crusoe first expressed his abhorrence of such practices. He

then, if I remember rightly, made it known to Friday that he would surely kill him if he dug up and ate the body. But he wisely reenforced the sentiment and the threat by demonstrating to Friday the merits of young goat, stewed, broiled, and roasted. Whereupon, it is written, Friday of his own initiative decided that he would never eat man again.

Reasonable men are now inoculating their less civilized brethren with the feeling that the settlement of international disputes by violence is abhorrent to honor and justice, and even to enlightened selfishness. They will soon have an international court and police to keep any nation Friday from relapse into wholesale murder, arson, and political cannibalism. But it may be useful to make sure also that other tastes are stimulated so that the peace of nations may bring an added zest and richness to life.

It is a nice problem in psychology to measure just what will be lost from human nature when nations have disarmed and war is as discreditable as piracy. It is even more interesting to decide what best to give men to replace their hankerings for the thrills of national revenge and bloodshed.

First, we must separate the effect on the *participants*—those who, for love of country, love of money, or love of excitement, do the killing and orphaning—from the effect on the *onlookers*. These, too, must be divided into those who are paying the price of the war-game, wearing their hearts out with the misery it is bringing to them and their fellow men, and, on the other hand, the deadheads—the "bums"—who neither fight nor suffer, only chuckle because "we lost ten thousand while they lost thirty," or curse the army that let itself be killed—who sit in the corner grocery or by the "ticker," telling how they would have done it! These last, it will appear, are the only losers from peace.

The "born" warrior, the professional soldier, even the fighting sport and adventurer, and all who would by choice partici-

pate in wars, will not suffer when wars have gone the way of trial by fire, blood-feud, and piracy. They need not lose one jot or tittle of the joy of living. As international police, serving the international department of justice and correction, they can be happily engaged in preventing outrages by any nation, in taking concealed weapons away from any dishonorable party, in actually putting *hors de combat* any twentieth century Napoleon who may wish to try his might against the right of the civilized world. There will be just about enough war-work for such men.

The onlookers who pay, the mothers, children, and friends of those who fight, ask no equivalent emotions for those which war would bring. The excitement, anxiety, terror, and endless grief no one, even under the insane obsessions of primitive warlust, will crave. The pride is only that which will come in purer form and higher degree from any useful service the son or father performs in the world. Indeed, if deprived of the artificial medium of a code of revenge no longer acceptable as honorable or just, war must less and less arouse any patriotic feeling, and more and more be felt as a mere misfortune of human nature. A son killed in war will be reckoned as a victim to human stupidity, like one hit by a chance shot from a street fight, run over by a careless engineer, or poisoned by ill-inspected meat.

Cheap rhetoric has tried to convince us that the mother's grief is purified into resignation and pride by the knowledge that her boy's life was given to a righteous cause. This insult to every boy and mother on the other side can bring condolence only to a narrow mind, and never when there is a just suspicion that the war was nowise needed for the triumph of the cause.

Men and women are beginning to see the difference between being in the right in a dispute and having a right to go to war over it. If it should be known that Canada had stupidly

refused to make reparation of say $100,000 as stipulated for some violation of a fishery-treaty, we all might agree that our country was in the right, but a majority of sane men would equally agree that our government did not have a right to set a hundred million decent people at war because of the stupidity of certain Canadian officials. A thousand men here and in Canada would promptly offer to pay the fine and save the war. We would no more go to war with Canada for $100,000 than we would tear the rags from a destitute orphan because her father owed us two cents. We are all learning that a righteous cause is a cause for war only when the wrong done by the war is less than the right it preserves. Nor will there be in the future any such readiness as there has been in the past to assume that the war which someone is interested in stirring up is really in the defense of national welfare. . . .

The only losers by peace are the deadheads—the bums—who neither fight nor suffer. They lose the cheap excitement of contemplating wholesale murder and of playing with the lives of nations. They are jealous of national dignity because they "like to see a good scrap." They do not believe in compromise because it is "tame." They would like to show what we could do in a war! . . .

It is worth while to seek a substitute for war for even this despicable mob. For we all belong to it. In its cheap enjoyments we all share. There is in us all a lust for the cowardly excitement of looking on at conflict. This is held down somewhat by a decent regard for the happiness of mankind and by whatever prudent insight we have into the eventual cost of war to our own fortunes. It is choked off somewhat by interests in family, friends, knowledge, beauty, and skill. But a little relaxation of the humane habits and tastes which have been laboriously taught us suffices to release it, and we gloat over the game of war. We all relapse easily into

shoddy patriotism, esteem ourselves for the skill of "our" generals, swell with pride at "our" army's valor, and appropriate as a personal dignity the heroism of which we read. . . . No one of us has fully mastered the first lessons of citizenship—to think of things as they are, to want the common good, and to act from reason. While we are learning them, we need to beguile ourselves from false national pride and from cheap excitement at vicarious conflict.

To substitute a rational patriotism for self-congratulation at the exploits of a military "team" involves teaching ourselves to take pride in what we have earned and to prize only worthy achievements. Both tasks are hard. By original nature, man prizes his advantage over others rather than his absolute welfare.

A moderate amount of forethought on the part of teachers, editors, and preachers would give common habit a turn toward the question: Is my city proud of having me belong to it? What does America gain because I am an American? We need not at any rate deliberately attach self-congratulation to those situations which properly evoke only humble gratitude, or give systematic lessons in applying to oneself the honor due to another.

More can be done than to release patriotism from being pauperized. We can open the mind to the real nature of citizenship. In so far as boys and girls learn that any act whatever that makes their city or country a better place for good people to live in is an act of good citizenship—that efficient labor, skillful professional service, healthy and noble pleasures are important features of citizenship—they will abandon shoddy patriotism. By seeing that they can give something, they will take pride in giving, will give more, and will regard their country's successes, not as a spectacle for their benefit, but as a business in which they have a share.

The other half of the problem—teaching ourselves to prize

only worthy national achievements—is also made needlessly hard by the conventional exaggeration of the litigious virtues which survive as a relic from the days before the discovery of truth, the organization and economy of labor, and deliberate constructive work for human welfare were recognized activities of the state. Just as our arithmetics contain problems that can be traced unfailingly back to the days of barter in Venice in the sixteenth century, so even the best of our school histories is a lineal descendant of the songs sung at war-dances and cannibal feasts.

The best way to teach ourselves to appreciate worthy national enterprises is to engage in them. Interests and emotions are the products as well as the producers of acts. We create zeal by zealous behavior. Let men work together at building the Panama Canal and conserving needed forests; at putting an end to malaria, yellow fever, tuberculosis, the white-slave traffic and child-labor; at providing employment for all capable and willing workers and education in a trade for every boy and girl able to learn one. They will soon come to feel an honorable pride in their own race or nation—pride in what it achieves for its own and the world's good. They will find the game of welfare as interesting as the game of war.

This is not a Utopian solution. The zest for vicarious war, for contemplating the conflicts of military "teams," has lived not so much by its intrinsic attractiveness as by heavy subsidies. Put a million dollars a day into any national enterprise, say a crusade against tuberculosis, and it acquires interest. Devote a large fraction of literary talent for two thousand years to advertising the adventures of a public-health army, and the career of a hunter of microbes will become attractive. The intrinsic difficulty of arousing interest in exterminating the tubercle bacillus or freeing children from slavery or putting Justice on the throne of

industry, may not be greater than that of arousing an equal interest in exterminating the aborigines, or freeing Cuba, or putting a Bourbon on the throne of France.

Suppose that from '61 to '65 we had spent three thousand million dollars in a campaign to free little children from misery in factories and mines. The health, happiness, and education of children would be of public interest. Suppose that since then the pension expense, now over three million dollars a week, had been given up to discovering and helping men of genius to turn their passion for truth and beauty to the world's advantage. We should appreciate the worth of provision by a state for the discovery, conservation, and use of its human resources.

Suppose that we now maintained at a cost of two hundred and seventy-five millions a year an army of physicians, men of science, and nurses to eradicate tuberculosis. The mere expenditure of what our military establishment now costs us would make every village church and city club a center of interested discussion of the latest news from the tenements!

As a matter of fact, we are, year by year, more rapidly acquiring interests which will protect us against cowardly zest as onlookers at a cock-pit of nations. In their sober senses the plain people of this country no more hanker after a look at the war-game than they hanker after bull-fights or the trial by fire. Public enterprise is being directed less toward a fretful defense of national prerogatives, and more toward an energetic fight for the inward means of national dignity. The settlement of national disputes by force is doomed to have in the life of reason only the painful interest of a pitiable accident, like the wrecking of a train by an incompetent switchman, or the murder of his family by a maniac. —Edward L. Thorndike, The Emotional Price of Peace, in Documents of The American Association for International Conciliation, 1911.

Labor is the great Conqueror. Not War, but Work, is the great Educator; and the essential watchword of all permanent advance. When the militarist tells us that Peace on earth is a mere dream, and "not even a beautiful dream"; when he solemnly warns us that "without War the world would sink in a morass of materialism"; he appears to see no choice open between perpetuation of murder on a grand scale, and a state of demoralizing lethargy. But the world is now too old to impale itself on the horns of this imaginary dilemma. The world is becoming aware that "Peace hath her victories, not less renowned than War" and infinitely more productive. Proof is everywhere that it is not the men that give up fighting, who lose stamina and virility; but the men who give up work. The most "unfit" are they who least cooperate in the great struggle of their race against whatever in its environment obstructs real progress and development. And of all such obstacles War is the greatest, as may at any time be clearly seen from the condition of those peoples who chiefly occupy their time in conflict, either with their neighbors or among themselves. And it is these, and not the prosperous, hard-working, peace-loving populations, who reap the fruit of their transgression of primordial Law.

Why is Germany, for instance, great and successful (in 1911)? Not because she is military, but because she is busy. No doubt her last great War indirectly helped to weld her Empire, because it drew the German peoples together for a gigantic cooperative effort. But it was the awakened spirit of mutual service and national cooperation, not the direct fruits of the combat, which constituted the foundation of her remarkable development during forty years of fruitful peace. The ostensible gains from the war of 1870, whether of wealth or territory, gave her no help at all. Within three years of the final payment of Indemnity by France, Bismarck himself said, referring in the Reichstag to German commerce

and finance, "We are slowly bleeding to death." The acquisition of Alsace-Lorraine has involved the bitterest heart-burnings, together with enormous trouble and expense. Germany is great and successful because she puts brains into all her work, and sticks to it with Teutonic persistence. . . .

—William Leighton Grane, The Passing of War, p. 61.
(The Macmillan Company, Publishers.)

## THE RIGHT USE OF FORCE

Force may be briefly defined as power made effective for use. Thus we speak of spiritual, mental, and physical force, and of the various forces of nature. Without force no results are accomplished. Therefore, when a man of peace says, "I do not believe in using force," however praiseworthy his meaning may be, his words are incorrect, and he lays himself open to the charge of being a mere visionary. When he explains: "I believe not in the use of physical, but of spiritual and moral force," his opponent answers: "Your child is about to cut himself with a sharp knife; will you not snatch it from him?" "Certainly." "He is running toward a precipice. You shout to him to stop. Either he does not hear, or will not obey. Will you not run and catch him, and save him?" He replies, "That is different. It is right to do these things." Yes, it is right, but you cannot do them without physical force. Your real contention, then, is not against physical force, as such, but against the wrong use of it.

We cannot even say that under all circumstances the use of brute force is wrong. A Samson might hold a lunatic or a criminal, to restrain him from violence, in his strong embrace, not brutally, but by brute force, and receive from the most ardent peace advocate nothing but praise. Then even brute force is not always wrong, so it be not brutally used.

Further, if physical force may sometimes be well used, spiritual and moral force may be wrongly used. The assassin

of our late President, for instance, claimed his deed to be morally right, and if, as the Bible says, there be such a thing as spiritual wickedness, there must also be a wrong use of spiritual power.

From the simple human standpoint, which is, after all, hardly removed from the divine, we may therefore conclude that of all the great divisions of force, spiritual and moral, physical and mechanical, none are in themselves either right or wrong, but that the moral element lies in the manner in which they are used and the object to be gained.

—Richard Henry Thomas, The Christian Idea of Force, in the Report of The American Friends' Peace Conference, pp. 770, 771.

Is it ever right to do wrong? Will the achievement of great and beneficent results justify the commission of an act which, but for these results, would be immoral? Has a man the right to put his conscience in the path of progress and impose the consequences of his beliefs upon other people? May we hold a theory as right in itself if in practice it is impossible?

—Isaac Sharpless, To What Extent Are Peace Principles Practicable? in the Reports of The American Friends' Peace Conference, p. 137.

It is not brute force but moral power that commands predominance in the world. —Lord Haldane.

## MORAL EQUIVALENTS

The war against war is going to be no holiday excursion or camping party. The military feelings are too deeply grounded to abdicate their place among our ideals until better substitutes are offered than the glory and shame that come to nations as well as to individuals from the ups and downs of politics and the vicissitudes of trade. . . .

Modern war is so expensive that we feel trade to be a better avenue to plunder; but modern man inherits all the innate pugnacity and all the love of glory of his ancestors. Showing war's irrationality and horror is of no effect upon him. The horrors make the fascination. War is the *strong* life; it is life *in extremis;* war-taxes are the only ones men never hesitate to pay, as the budgets of all nations show us. . . .

It is plain that on this subject civilized man has developed a sort of double personality. If we take European nations, no legitimate interest of any one of them would seem to justify the tremendous destructions which a war to compass it would necessarily entail. It would seem as though common sense and reason ought to find a way to reach agreement in every conflict of honest interests. I myself think it our bounden duty to believe in such international rationality as possible. But, as things stand, I see how desperately hard it is to bring the peace-party and the war-party together, and I believe that the difficulty is due to certain deficiencies in the program of pacifism which set the militarist imagination strongly, and to a certain extent justifiably, against it. In the whole discussion both sides are on imaginative and sentimental ground. . . . In my remarks, pacificist though I am, I will refuse to speak of the bestial side of the war-régime and consider only the higher aspects of militaristic sentiment. . . .

Reflective apologists for war at the present day all take it religiously. It is a sort of sacrament. Its profits are to the vanquished as well as to the victor; and quite apart from any question of profit, it is an absolute good, we are told, for it is human nature at its highest dynamic. Its "horrors" are a cheap price to pay for rescue from the only alternative supposed, of a world of clerks and teachers, of coeducation and zoophily, of "consumers' leagues" and "associated chari-

ties," of industrialism unlimited, and feminism unabashed. No scorn, no hardness, no valor any more! Fie upon such a cattleyard of a planet!

So far as the central essence of this feeling goes, no healthy minded person, it seems to me, can help to some degree partaking of it. Militarism is the great preserver of our ideals of hardihood, and human life with no use for hardihood would be contemptible. Without risks or prizes for the darer, history would be insipid indeed; and there is a type of military character which every one feels that the race should never cease to breed, for every one is sensitive to its superiority. . . .

This natural sort of feeling forms, I think, the innermost soul of army-writings. Without any exception known to me, militarist authors take a highly mystical view of their subject and regard war as a biological or sociological necessity, uncontrolled by ordinary psychological necessity. When the time of development is ripe the war must come, reason or no reason, for the justifications pleaded are invariably fictitious. War is, in short, a permanent human *obligation*. General Homer Lea, in his recent book, "The Valor of Ignorance," plants himself squarely on this ground. Readiness for war is for him the essence of nationality, and ability in it the supreme measure of the health of nations. . . .

War, according to S. R. Steinmetz, is an ordeal instituted by God, who weighs the nations in its balance. It is the essential form of the State, and the only function in which peoples can employ all their powers at once and convergently. No victory is possible save as the resultant of a totality of virtues, no defeat for which some vice or weakness is not responsible. Fidelity, cohesiveness, tenacity, heroism, conscience, education, inventiveness, economy, wealth, physical health and vigor—there isn't a moral or intellectual point of superiority that doesn't tell, when God holds his assizes and hurls the peoples upon one another. . . .

The virtues that prevail, it must be noted, are virtues anyhow, superiorities that count in peaceful as well as in military competition; but the strain on them, being infinitely intenser in the latter case, makes war infinitely more searching as a trial. No ordeal is comparable to its winnowings. Its dread hammer is the welder of men into cohesive states, and nowhere but in such states can human nature adequately develop its capacity. The only alternative is "degeneration." . . .

If we speak of the *fear of emancipation from the fear-régime,* we put, it seems to me, the whole situation into a single phrase; fear regarding ourselves now taking the place of the ancient fear of the enemy.

Turn the fear over as I will in my mind, it all seems to lead back to two unwillingnesses of the imagination, one æsthetic and the other moral: unwillingness, first to envisage a future in which army life, with its many elements of charm, shall be forever impossible, and in which the destinies of peoples shall nevermore be decided quickly, thrillingly, and tragically, by force, but only gradually and insipidly by "evolution"; and, secondly, unwillingness to see the supreme theater of human strenuousness closed, and the splendid military aptitudes of men doomed to keep always in a state of latency and never show themselves in action. These insistent unwillingnesses, no less than other æsthetic and ethical insistences have, it seems to me, to be listened to and respected. One cannot meet them effectively by mere counter-insistency on war's expensiveness and horror. The horror makes the thrill; and when the question is of getting the extremest and supremest out of human nature, talk of expense sounds ignominious. The weakness of so much merely negative criticism is evident—pacificism makes no converts from the military party. The military party denies neither the bestiality, nor the horror, nor the expense; it only says

that things tell but half the story. It only says that war is *worth* them; that, taking human nature as a whole, its wars are its best protection against its weaker and more cowardly self, and that mankind cannot *afford* to adopt a peace-economy.

Pacificists ought to enter more deeply into the esthetical and ethical point of view of their opponents. Do that first in any controversy, says J. J. Chapman, *then move the point,* and your opponent will follow. So long as anti-militarists propose no substitute for war's disciplinary function, no *moral equivalent* of war, analogous, as one might say, to the mechanical equivalent of heat, so long they fail to realize the full inwardness of the situation. And as a rule they do fail. The duties, penalties, and sanctions pictured in the utopias they paint are all too weak and tame to touch the military-minded. . . .

Having said thus much in preparation, I will now confess my own utopia. I devoutly believe in the reign of peace and in the gradual advent of some sort of a socialistic equilibrium. The fatalistic view of the war-function is to me nonsense, for I know that war-making is due to definite motives and subject to prudential checks and reasonable criticism, just like any other form of enterprise. And when whole nations are the armies, and the science of destruction vies in intellectual refinement with the sciences of production, I see that war becomes absurd and impossible from its own monstrosity. Extravagant ambitions will have to be replaced by reasonable claims, and nations must make common cause against them. I see no reason why all this should not apply to yellow as well as to white countries, and I look forward to a future when acts of war shall be formally outlawed as between civilized peoples.

All these beliefs of mine put me squarely into the anti-militarist party. But I do not believe that peace either ought

to be or will be permanent on this globe, unless the states pacifically organized preserve some of the old elements of army discipline. A permanently successful peace-economy cannot be a simple pleasure-economy. In the more or less socialistic future towards which mankind seems drifting we must still subject ourselves collectively to those severities which answer to our real position upon this only partly hospitable globe. We must make new energies and hardihoods continue the manliness to which the military mind so faithfully clings. Martial virtues must be the enduring cement; intrepidity, contempt of softness, surrender of private interest, obedience to command, must still remain the rock upon which states are built—unless, indeed, we wish for dangerous reactions against commonwealths fit only for contempt, and liable to invite attack whenever a center of crystallization for military-minded enterprise gets formed anywhere in their neighborhood.

The war-party is assuredly right in affirming and reaffirming that the martial virtues, although originally gained by the race through war, are absolute and permanent human goods. Patriotic pride and ambition in their military form are, after all, only specifications of a more general competitive passion. They are its first form, but that is no reason for supposing them to be its last form. Men now are proud of belonging to a conquering nation, and without a murmur they lay down their persons and their wealth, if by so doing they may fend off subjection. But who can be sure that *other aspects of one's country* may not, with time and education and suggestion enough, come to be regarded with similarly effective feelings of pride and shame? Why should men not some day feel that it is worth a blood-tax to belong to a collectivity superior in *any* ideal respect? Why should they not blush with indignant shame if the community that owns them is vile in any way whatsoever? Individuals, daily

more numerous, now feel this civic passion. It is only a question of blowing on the spark until the whole population gets incandescent, and on the ruins of the old morals of military honor a stable system of morals of civic honor builds itself up. What the whole community comes to believe in grasps the individual as in a vise. The war-function has grasped us so far, but constructive interests may some day seem no less imperative, and impose on the individual a hardly lighter burden. . . .

If now there was, instead of military conscription, a conscription of the whole youthful population to form for a certain number of years a part of the army enlisted against *Nature,* the injustice would tend to be evened out, and numerous other goods to the commonwealth would follow. The military ideals of hardihood and discipline would be wrought into the growing fiber of the people; no one would remain blind, as the luxurious classes now are blind, to man's real relations to the globe he lives on, and to the permanently sour and hard foundations of his higher life. To coal and iron mines, to freight trains, to fish fleets in December, to dish-washing, clothes-washing, and window-washing, to road-building and tunnel-making, to foundries and stoke-holes, and to the frames of skyscrapers, would our gilded youths be drafted off, according to their choice, to get the childishness knocked out of them, and to come back into society with healthier sympathies and soberer ideas. They would have paid their blood-tax, done their own part in the immemorial human warfare against nature, they would tread the earth more proudly, the women would value them more highly, they would be better fathers and teachers of the following generation. . . .

So far, war has been the only force that can discipline a whole community, and until an equivalent discipline is organized, I believe the war must have its way. But I have

no serious doubt that the ordinary prides and shames of social man, once developed to a certain intensity, are capable of organizing such a moral equivalent as I have sketched, or some other just as effective for preserving manliness of type. It is but a question of time, of skillful propagandism, and of opinion-making men seizing historic opportunities.

The martial type of character can be bred without war. Strenuous honor and disinterestedness abound elsewhere. Priests and medical men are in a fashion educated to it, and we should all feel some degree of it imperative if we were conscious of our work as an obligatory service to the state. We should be *owned,* as soldiers are by the army, and our pride would rise accordingly. We could be poor, then, without humiliation, as army officers now are. The only thing needed henceforward is to inflame the civic temper as past history has inflamed the military temper. . . .

The amount of alteration in public opinion which my utopia postulates is vastly less than the difference between the mentality of those black warriors who pursued Stanley's party on the Congo with their cannibal war-cry of "Meat! Meat!" and that of the "general staff" of any civilized nation. History has seen the latter interval bridged over: the former one can be bridged over much more easily.

—William James, Moral Equivalents, pp. 3-20, in The Documents of the American Association for International Conciliation.

In Aristophanes' drama of Peace he describes Trygaeus, a rustic patriot, weary of the awful wastes of the Peloponnesian war, mounting on the back of a beetle into heaven, hoping there to find the goddess of peace and to invoke her service. But he found instead the fierce god of war, while Peace was confined in a dungeon beneath the feet of War, the lid held down by heavy stones. The indomitable patriot fastens

a rope to the lid and tries to rally a force to lay hold of the rope, uncover the dungeon and restore Peace to her supremacy. But the gods were busy with other tasks. The spear-makers and the retailers of shields refused to lay hold because they looked for larger sales. Those who wished to be generals would not assist. The combatants fell to quarreling with each other and pulled in opposite directions. Lamachus, in full array, sought to dissuade those who would release Peace. At last, in his despair, he appealed to a band of husbandmen, and these lusty toilers of the field, humble men of the soil, laid hold and the cover was lifted and Peace was released from her confinement. The city rejoiced in the happy restoration, but the crest-makers, the makers of javelins and the sword-cutters were sullen and silent, while the sickle-makers rejoiced over the spear-makers and Trygaeus cheered the farmers, crying: "Depart as quickly as possible to the fields with your instruments of husbandry. Go without spear and sword and javelin. Go every one of you to work in the field." Having sung the pæan, the chorus, speaking for the husbandmen, chants: "O day longed for by the just, with delight I get to my vines. I find my fig trees, which a long time ago I planted."

So must we turn to the humble toilers of the field, the home-makers, . . . the mothers of men, the obscure men of science, the peaceful men of God, for that heroism that is above war, independent of its inspirations, an antidote to its devastations, an emancipator of its slaves. This higher heroism will enable even military men to sleep untroubled by fitful dreams of invading enemies pouncing upon our unsuspecting Republic some dark night from the East or from the West. For he is doubly armed who is armed with righteousness.

—Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Peace, Not War, the School of Heroism, Reports Fourth American Peace Congress, p. 308.

## CHAPTER VI

## PREVENTIVES OF WAR, ARBITRATION

Peace rules the day when reason rules the mind.
—William Collins

He shall speak peace unto the nations.
—Zech. 9:10.

### ARBITRATION A POSSIBILITY AND A NECESSITY

The pacific methods of settling international disputes are designed to deal with legal differences and to as great an extent as possible with political differences. Practically no political difference, involving conflict between national policies, is without its distinctly legal side. Amicable methods include negotiations, good offices and mediation, commissions of inquiry and arbitration. Of these methods, arbitration has held public attention almost to the exclusion of consideration of the other methods, which are of a less definite character. Of the other methods the commission of inquiry is capable of very great development.

Negotiation, the customary method of adjusting disputes, is conducted by diplomatic officers, and consists of verbal or written exchanges with the object of agreement. Negotiation is ordinarily conducted between two governments, and carried on at one or both capitals, as convenient.

Good offices and mediation are alike in character, but differ in kind, the first usually including a proffer of the

latter. Both methods originate with a third and disinterested power. Secretary of State Hay described good offices as "the unofficial advocacy of interests which the agent [the third power] may properly represent, but which it may not be convenient to present and discuss on a full diplomatic footing"; and "it is allied to arbitral intermediation as an impartial adviser of both parties." Mediation is a step further, and gives the third power the right to become a quasi-negotiator, but solely in the interest of a settlement satisfactory to the two principals.

The commission of inquiry is extra-diplomatic, and its function is to determine facts about which the disputants differ or are in doubt.

Arbitration is now a legal method, and "has for its object the settlement of disputes between states by judges of their own choice and on the basis of respect for law." An arbitral court at present has a competence for both law and equity, which does not exist as such in international legal relations. Compromise in the interest of even-handed justice may therefore be resorted to, but will decrease as international law and decisions cover more detailed matters.

—Denys P. Myers, The Commission of Inquiry, p. 1, World Peace Foundation.

There are no international controversies so serious that they cannot be settled peaceably if both parties really desire peaceable settlement; while there are few causes of dispute so trifling that they cannot be made the occasion of war if either party really desires war. The matters in dispute between nations are nothing; the spirit which deals with them is everything. . . .

The review which I have made has shown that all the foreign wars in which we have engaged were brought on by our own precipitate action, that they were not inevitable,

and that they might have been avoided by the exercise of prudence and conciliation. It also shows that it has been possible for us to live in peace with our nearest neighbor, with which we have the most extensive and intimate relations, the most perplexing and troublesome questions. Our history also shows that during our whole life as an independent nation no country has shown toward us a spirit of aggression or a disposition to invade our territory. If such is the case, is it not time that every true patriot, every lover of his country and of its fair fame in the world, every friend of humanity, should strive to curb the spirit of aggression and military glory among our people and seek to create an earnest sentiment against all war?

—John W. Foster, War Not Inevitable, Extracts from pp. 9-15.

I can conceive but one thing which will really affect the military and naval expenditure of the world on the wholesale scale on which it must be affected if there is to be a real and sure relief. You will not get it until nations do what individuals have done—come to regard an appeal to the law as the natural course for nations instead of an appeal to force.

—Sir Edward Grey.

In his address to the American Peace and Arbitration League of New York, on the 22d of March, 1910, Mr. Taft said:

"Personally I do not see any more reason why matters of national honor should not be referred to a court of arbitration than matters of property or matters of national proprietorship. I know that is going further than most men are willing to go; but I do not see why questions of honor may not be submitted to a tribunal supposed to be composed of men of honor, who understand questions of national honor,

and then abide by their decisions, as well as any other question of difference arising between nations."

—Quoted in Documents of The American Association for International Conciliation, 1911, p. 6.

Grotius, in his great work, *De Jure Belli ac Pacis,* says of Arbitration: "Christian kings and States are bound, above all others, to adopt this expedient to prevent war. Therefore, it would be useful, and in some sort necessary, that the Christian powers should appoint some body in which the disputes of any State might be settled by the judgment of the others which are not interested."

On looking at all the wars which have been carried on during the last century, and examining into the causes of them, *I do not see one of these wars in which, if there had been proper temper between the parties, the questions in dispute might not have been settled without recourse to arms.* —Lord Russell.

It is certain that if the good people of all parties and creeds, sinking for the time other political questions whenever the issue of war arises, were to demand arbitration, no government dare refuse. They have it in their power in every emergency to save their country from war and insure unbroken peace.

If in every constituency there were organized an Arbitration League, consisting of members who agree that arbitration of international disputes must be offered, or accepted by the government if offered by the adversary, pledging themselves to vote in support of, or in opposition to, political parties according to their action upon this question, it is surprising how soon both parties would accept arbitration as a policy. I know of no work that would prove more fruitful

for your country and for the world than this. It is by concentrating upon one issue that great causes are won.

—Andrew Carnegie, A League of Peace, p. 41, in Documents of The American Association for International Conciliation, 1907-8.

Men will not fight if they have time to grow cool. Nations will not fight if they have time to think. The penalties and degradations of war are too great, the agonies of the weak and helpless, the aged and other noncombatants, are too horrible, the waste of wealth, the destruction of industry and commerce, are too vast to be endured when there is a way to peace. I am in favor of the general arbitration treaty principle, and I indorse the idea of the new treaties with Great Britain and France because I believe that questions which might otherwise result in war should be first taken away from the influence of party politics and considered seriously in the calm, neutral air of some impartial tribunal, whose findings must at least morally bind the contending nations to submit to international arbitration all questions which may be found solvable according to principles of law and equity. The world's greatest need is a breakwater against temporary passions. War is too horrible to be entered upon in cold blood and with deliberation when there is any other possible way to settle the question in dispute. —James Cardinal Gibbons, The Advantages of Arbitration, pp. 15, 16.

**SUCCESSFUL ARBITRATION**

The four hundred and fifty disputes successfully arbitrated in the past century challenge with trumpet-tongued eloquence the support of all men for reason's peaceful rule. To-day no discussion is needed to show that if war is to be abolished, if navies are to dwindle and armies diminish, if there is to be a federation of the world, it must come through treaties of

arbitration. In this way alone lies peace; yet in this way lies the present great barrier to further progress—the conception which many nations, especially the United States, hold of "national honor and vital interests." The reservation from arbitration of so-called matters of national honor and vital interests constitutes the weak link in every existing arbitration treaty between the great powers of the world. This reservation furnishes the big-navy men all the argument they need. It destroys the binding power of the treaties by allowing either party to any dispute to refuse arbitration.

—Russell Weisman, National Honor and Vital Interests, p. 7.

The first Hague Conference was the nearest approach the world has ever seen to a common legislative assembly for all the nations. The facilities and machinery it provided for arbitration have had incalculable results, and every new precedent for this peaceful method of settling international quarrels strengthens the chain by tending to develop the habit of looking to arbitration as the natural alternative of war. From first to last, something like a thousand disputes between historic nations have been peacefully adjusted.

—Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, International Arbitration, p. 10, in Documents of The American Association for International Conciliation, 1911.

At this first Hague Conference, only twenty-six Powers were represented; at the second, in 1907, the represented Powers were forty-four, including practically the civilized world. The working of the law of acceleration, in this leap in the number of represented States from twenty-six to forty-four in eight years, is similarly prominent in the rapidly growing acceptance of the Arbitration principle as a mode of settling national disputes. Dividing the eighty years from 1820 to 1900 into four periods of twenty years each, the

number of cases submitted and decided stands as follows: 34 only in the first period of twenty years; 63 in the second; 115 in the third; and in the last period, 187.

—William Leighton Grane, The Passing of War, Extracts from pp. 184, 185. (Macmillan, Pub.)

Just as soon as you and I, in whose hands the final decision for or against war must ever rest, express through the force of an irresistible public opinion the doctrine that our conception of national honor demands the arbitration of every dispute, just so soon will our legislators free themselves from financial dictators and liberate the country from the dominance of a false conception of national honor.

Do you say this ideal is impractical? History proves that questions of the utmost importance can be peacefully settled without the loss of honor. The Casa Blanca dispute between France and Germany, the Venezuela question, the North Atlantic Fisheries case, the Alabama claims—these are proof indisputable that questions of honor may be successfully arbitrated. "Does not this magnificent achievement," says Carl Schurz of the Alabama settlement, "form one of the most glorious pages of the common history of England and America? Truly, the two great nations that accomplish this need not be afraid of unadjustable questions of honor in the future." —Louis Broido, National Honor and Peace, p. 5.

International Arbitration is the only means by which we can accomplish our aim, and all fervent advocates, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from one end of the world to the other, should unite for this one purpose.

But not alone do European and American States resort to Arbitration; for in 1876 Persia and Afghanistan referred their differences to Arbitration, and again in 1879 China and Japan did the same.

International Arbitration is, for the moment, the only possible means to avoid deadly conflicts.

It has already given a splendid showing lately in preventing conflicts, not only among civilized nations, but in some cases also among people called barbarous.

The first arbitration of the modern period took place in 1794, between England and the United States, and it was decided by three members named by each of the two nations. Five other controversies have taken place between the above mentioned nations since 1871, and every one has been decided by means of Arbitration.

—Sir Victor Teggio, in Report of Fifth Universal Peace Congress, pp. 112, 113.

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF ARBITRATION**

As men have risen to higher ideals of honor in their relations with one another, so nations have risen to a higher standard in international affairs. Centuries ago tyrants ruled and waged war on any pretext; now before rulers rush to arms, they stop to count the cost. Nations once thought it honorable to use poisoned bullets and similar means of destruction; a growing humanitarianism has compelled them to abandon such practices. At one time captives were killed outright; there was a higher conception of honor when they were forced into slavery; now the quickening sense of universal sympathy compels belligerent nations to treat prisoners of war humanely and to exchange them at the close of the conflict. At one time neutrals were not protected; now their rights are generally recognized.

—Louis Broido, National Honor and Peace, p. 4.

After Christian missions, the most prophetic and splendid fact in modern history is The Hague Conference; and next to it, perhaps, is the Pan-American Alliance.

—Amory H. Bradford.

The idea of international cooperation as a means of lessening the dangers and mitigating the brutalities of warfare, of improving the laws and customs that regulate international intercourse, and finally of reducing the awful and ever-growing burden of competitive armament is not new. Dante dreamed of a model emperor under whose wise control all nations would dwell in peace. Marsilio of Padua thought of a universal democratic church, whose ecumenical councils might reflect a republican union of states. Erasmus marveled how Christians, "members of one body, fed by the same sacraments, attached to the same Head, called to the same immortality, hoping for the same communion with Christ, could allow anything in the world to provoke them to war." Disputes between nations, as between individuals, there must be; but why should not all parties agree to submit to the old Roman arbitrament of good men? And might not a general peace be brought about in the Christian world by agreement between the rulers under the hegemony of Pope and Emperor? The dreadful wars of the Reformation converted at least one calculating statesman into an idealist. The Grand Design of Henry the Fourth sprang, in all probability, from the brain of Sully, in whose Memoirs it stands recorded, an imperishable monument of political sagacity. A treaty "done at The Hague," between Henry of Navarre, Elizabeth, and the Dutch Republic, was clearly intended to pave the way for this great League of Peace. Twenty-two years later Hugo Grotius was imprisoned in the Dutch capital, and afterward, taking refuge in France, prepared and published his immortal work on the Law of War and Peace.

—Francis W. Hirst, American Association for International Conciliation, 1909, Extracts from pp. 3, 4.

The movement has a purely human and rational side, so

that even among pagan nations and before the Christian era cases of this mode of settling disputes are recorded, and many others doubtless occurred which have passed into oblivion. The madness and insanity of war did not always prevail. There were lucid moments when the real human nature temporarily asserted itself. Two sons of Darius settled the question of the succession to the throne by arbitration. Cyrus sought the good offices of a Prince of India to end a dispute between him and the king of Assyria. In the Greek civilization, where the state was everything and love of country an all-absorbing passion, cases of arbitration between Greek and Greek were not infrequent, though no Greek state seems ever to have arbitrated with a foreign country. In these the Amphictyonic Councils, famous sages, victors in the games and especially the Oracle at Delphi were the arbitrators. The system of law and of law courts, in which the citizens of a country determine their questions by a forced litigation under the power of the civil authorities, has its root in practically the same principles as arbitration. In the Roman empire this system prevailed, and the simpler method of voluntary arbitration was not much known.

When Christianity came with its doctrine of love and human brotherhood, arbitration became a frequent and probably the usual method by which difficulties between individual Christians were settled. The reader will remember Paul's passionate appeal to the Corinthians in behalf of this simple Christian method as against the forced and selfish litigation in the law courts.

In later times the bishops' trials became a fixed institution among Christians. . . .

What was found so useful and practicable among individuals was naturally seen to be just as capable of successful application to groups and communities of men and it began early to be so applied. Private war, the great curse of the

middle ages, was banished from European society only after the application to it of private arbitration and arbitration courts. Feudalism had spread this evil everywhere. Challenges to battle were made for the most trivial and absurd causes. A state of almost utter lawlessness came to prevail, and strife and bloodshed were perpetual. Religious sentiment was invoked against the evil. The clergy preached peace. Men went from village to village proclaiming it in the name of Christ. Great councils were held to promote it. The popes sent out encyclicals in its behelf. The "Peace of God" was proclaimed, and certain days, places, and callings were placed under the protection of its sheltering wing. Religious fraternities or peace associations to reconcile enemies were formed. Pledges of peace were administered to the fierce barons over holy relics. But the tide of hatred and of blood surged on. Finally, as a last remedy, when all the efforts put forth for nearly two centuries against the evil seemed about to end in failure, courts of arbitration were formed by the barons, the nobles, the bishops and the cities, and for two centuries and more were applied from time to time to the settlement of the almost endless misunderstandings and quarrels of the time. In this way private war was ultimately banished from society.

From the beginning of the sixteenth to the opening of the nineteenth century we have the great war movements of nationalties—aggression, bloodshed, and desolation on a colossal scale. The feudal lords are replaced by kings and emperors in whom the old feudal spirit still lives. . . . "I saw," said Grotius, writing at this time, "throughout all Christendom a readiness to make war which would cause the very barbarians to blush for shame." . . . This long, gloomy period of international aggression and crime reached its culmination at the opening of the nineteenth century in the Napoleonic campaigns which ended at Waterloo. Then a

reaction came. The common conscience began to revolt at the sight of human beings forever devouring one another and of selfish, haughty sovereigns treading down and destroying all the most sacred rights and interests of men.

The first steps of this revolt had been taken in the seventeenth century. Christian conviction had become such and Christian principles had so influenced thought that the war system began to be attacked at its very roots. It was declared to be both unchristian and unreasonable. Hugo Grotius, the great Dutch jurist and theologian, who laid the foundations of the modern juridic movement against war, attacked it particularly on the latter ground. He declared that war was a cruel and unsatisfactory method, that its horrors should be mitigated and that arbitration should be substituted for it as far as practicable in the settlement of difficulties. He expounded his doctrine with so much erudition and force that he deeply affected the thought of Europe, and laid the foundation of international law. Publicists took up the problem which he had raised. The law of nations was unfolded and emphasized. Projects for universal peace were drawn up. . . .

Soon after the opening of the nineteenth century the movement against war took on an organized and definitive form. This organized movement growing out of these historic preparations and coming as a revolt against the bloody régime of the three preceding centuries, followed two lines of development, one sentimental, the other juridic. The sentimental, or that for the awakening and education of public sentiment against war, manifested itself during the nineteenth century in the organization of peace societies, in sermons and public lectures, in literary productions, through the press, through international congresses and conferences, through public manifestoes and memorials to governments; the juridic, or that for the creation of legal remedies for war, expressed

itself in improved diplomacy, in attempts to reform international law, in arbitration, and in efforts for the establishing of permanent treaties of arbitration and a permanent international tribunal. These two lines of movement, one of which is just as important as the other, have been interlaced at every stage and have grown strong together. The culmination of the arbitration side of the movement in actual practice during the last decade and a half has been very remarkable, as is now well known. . . .

The crowning event of the nineteenth century in the matter of arbitration, an event which grew out of the whole work of the century, was the establishment, at its close, of the Permanent International Court at The Hague. Such a court of arbitration had been advocated from the second decade of the century by the Peace Societies, and later by the International Law Association, the Peace Congresses, the Interparliamentary Union, national and local bar associations, special arbitration conferences, church assemblies, women's organizations, etc. . . .

The second Hague Conference cast its vote unanimously for the creation of a regular international court of justice with judges always in service and holding regular sessions. It failed to find a method of appointing the judges which would be satisfactory alike to the great and the small powers, but this difficulty will undoubtedly be surmounted in . . . time.

—Benjamin F. Trueblood, International Arbitration at the Opening of the Twentieth Century, Extracts from pp. 4-21, in Publications of The American Peace Society.

During the last ten years we have to record, besides the expansion of the commonwealth of international law and the establishment of certain important associations, the profound modification that the commonwealth of law has undergone in

its juristic structure. This transformation consists in the fact that the commonwealth has converted itself into a union of organized States. The great commonwealth has become a world-wide union of States. This is a result of the Hague Conferences, of which the importance to civilization is not sufficiently recognized. It is the dawn of a new era of a world-wide confederation of States. There was a time when the Cæsars of Rome, from one center, dominated the whole of the known world, and the great powers of the Middle Ages, the Empire and the Papacy, endeavored to restore this universal monarchic domination. Then the universal monarchy of the Middle Ages dissolved into an aggregation of Western States. In our time these States, augmented by those of the Far East and of parts of the world that were unknown to the Romans, are forming one great whole.

The importance of the first Hague Conference does not consist in the codification of the laws of continental warfare, which was accomplished there, but in the establishment of the Court of Arbitration. The States which participated in the first Hague Conference—among which the Asiatic States, China, Japan, Persia, and Siam were included from the outset—really organized themselves into a "Confederation of States," when they created a common instrument for maintaining peace in the commonwealth of international law. It matters little whether or no this title was immediately given to the new creation; in view of more timid minds it is as well that this was not done. But, as jurists, we are wont to speak of an association of States wherever we have a plurality of States with certain organs in common. In erecting a common tribunal, the civilized world created at the same time a union of international law, controlling the commonwealth of international public law. Although in reality the permanent Court of Arbitration as yet consists only of a list of names from which the contending parties must choose their judges

for each dispute, there is nevertheless an international office and commission, entitled the Council of Administration, just as in the case of particular associations under the law of nations. A periodical international Conference was not contemplated at first, but it has been found necessary for nearly all the unions of international law, as well as for the general Union of States. The first Hague Conference (1899) was followed by a second in 1907. The latter did not break up without expressing a hope of meeting again not later than 1915, and of making about two years' preparation for this third Conference. Thus the periodical character of the Hague Conferences is secured in fact, if not in law, and they will be, as in the case of special associations, the principal organ of the Union of States. In comparison with this completing of the commonwealth of international law by the association of States, the other achievements of the first Hague Conference are of secondary importance. The fact that in neither Conference was any practical measure taken in regard to the limitation of armaments does not diminish the service done in the direction of codifying international law.

—Dr. Walter Schucking, International Law Treaties, Conferences, and The Hague Tribunal, in Papers on Inter-Racial Problems, Extracts from pp. 393, 394.

## SYLLABUS ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION

*A.* Ancient period.

1. Oriental states: Arbitration had no place in an age when some one state must be supreme and all others subject.
2. Greece: Arbitration well known. About 75 cases recorded.

3. Rome: Arbitration known, but the extension of the Empire tended to bring it into disuse.
   Three classes of arbitration:
   International, federal, administrative.

*B.* Medieval period. Not a feature of the Middle Ages, though many differences were settled by means of arbitration.
1. Arbiters: Pope, emperor, various potentates, cities.
2. Cases of arbitral settlement in the Middle Ages are numerous, but relatively unimportant.

*C.* Modern period.
1. Early advocates of arbitration.
   Christ: The Prince of Peace.
   Peace of God and Truce of God in the Early Ages an attempt to put some limit upon perennial war.
   Religious denominations.
   The Mennonites (beginning about 1545).
   The Quakers or Friends.
   George Fox (1621-1697).
   Individual Peace Advocates.
   Pierre Du Bois (circa 1300).
   Henry IV. of France (1589-1610).
   Emeric Crucé (1590-1648).
   William Penn (1644-1718).
   Abbé de Saint-Pierre (1658-1743).
   J. J. Rousseau (1712-1778).
   Benjamin Franklin (1706-1790).
   Immanuel Kant (1724-1804).
2. Early treaties involving the principle of arbitration (1606-1697).
   Jay Treaty: United States and England, 1794. Usually regarded as the first modern treaty of arbitration.

3. The acceptance of arbitration by legislative bodies.
The United States played a leading rôle. (1835-1888).
France, first in Europe. 1849.
England, in 1849. Bill favoring arbitration defeated by Commons after violent debate.
In 1873 Commons approved arbitration.
The Netherlands, Italy, Sweden, Denmark, Belgium, all adopted arbitration measures between 1873 and 1878.
The establishment of the Interparliamentary Union, (1889), and the initial success of the Pan-American movement, practically saw the triumph of the principle of arbitration of international differences. Since that time the question has been what the scope of arbitration shall be.

—Edward Benjamin Krehbiel.

One class of questions which has proved for many years highly susceptible of arbitration is that of boundary disputes. Controversies over boundaries are difficult of direct negotiation because they seem to involve national "honor" and prestige, and they have, in the past, often threatened and sometimes actually caused war. Each side holds out strongly for its own interpretation of the evidence to the title. And yet it is often merely a matter of historical research (that is, a question of fact), or a question of the meaning of a treaty (that is, a question of law) to determine the boundary line.

—Randolph S. Bourne, in Documents of The American Association for International Conciliation, 1913, Extracts from p. 6.

The idea of International Arbitration as a means of settling differences between states and of averting wars is rooted

deeper in the social conscience of Englishmen and Americans than in other nations. And that, doubtless, because in England and America it is not only the product of utilitarian considerations but the postulate of religious convictions. Only a few weeks ago Carnegie declared that, ruinous as may be the costs of a war, they are "nothing in comparison to its iniquity." The widespread "Society of Friends" or Quakers, especially, have not wearied for more than a century in their efforts against war and in behalf of conciliation, but indeed all other religious bodies in England, Scotland, the United States, and Canada participate with the fullest zeal in the agitation for International Arbitration—and with them naturally (as is peculiarly interesting to us Austrians) the Catholic Church. Just as in England Cardinal Vaughan took a particularly ardent stand beside Gladstone and Rosebery in favor of arbitrating the controversy with the United States in the Venezuela crisis of 1895-6, so in America it was again Cardinal Gibbons who repeatedly urged the conciliation of international disagreements, most notably on the occasion of the meeting of the National Arbitration Committee at Washington in 1896.

—Heinrich Lammasch, in Documents of The American Association for International Conciliation, 1911, Extract from p. 4.

It is in the changes effected in men's feelings respecting what is morally permissible in warfare that is to be observed the most encouraging progress in international ethics in modern times. This progressive clarification of the moral consciousness may be distinctly traced from the close of the Thirty Years' War in Germany. In no period of Christian history had war been waged with greater ferocity or with greater contempt of moral rules than during the so-called religious wars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

What little gains had been made in the humanization of war during preceding eras seem to have been lost.

This barbarizing of war, however, produced, as all retrogression in morality does if the moral life is still on the whole virile and sound, a reaction which found expression in the epoch-making work, *De Jure Belli ac Pacis,* by the distinguished Dutch jurist Hugo Grotius. . . .

The influence of the work of Grotius was profound and widespread. From the time of its appearance dates a new departure in the humanization of war and a fresh moral advance in international law. "His ideals," says Dr. Andrew D. White, "found their way into current discussion, into systems of law, into treaties; and as generations rolled by, the world began to find itself, it hardly knew how, less and less cruel, until men looked back on war as practiced in his time as upon a hideous dream—doubtless much as men in future generations will look back upon the wars of our times."

—Extracts from pp. 375, 376, History as Past Ethics, by Philip Van Ness Myers; by permission of Ginn and Company, Publishers.

When arbitration has at last come into general and permanent use throughout the civilized world, as there is every reason to believe that it will after a generation or two, then these great military establishments with all their abominations will come to an end. The end of them may come suddenly, as the result of a great war, or a series of great wars, the disastrous results of which will be so deeply and universally felt that the nations will never again permit militarism to take root and grow. The end is more likely to come by a process of neglect and natural decay, when arbitration, universally adopted, shall have made the uselessness of such war preparations, as well as their wickedness and folly, manifest. It is more likely still to come through simultaneous

and gradual disarmament, entered upon by voluntary agreement, and possibly in connection with the adoption of some general system of arbitration.

—Benjamin F. Trueblood, The Federation of the World, Extracts from pp. 122, 123.

The Peace Society Agency, though very powerful and efficient, and increasingly so as the number of the associations increases from year to year, has been only one of the large group of agencies—religious, juridic, political, diplomatic, social, commercial, financial—which have, severally and jointly, pushed arbitration to the front as the only rational method of removing controversies after direct negotiation has failed.

The merits and practicability of arbitration need no longer be pleaded. It has already won its case at the bar of international public opinion. Beginning in a tentative way with the United States and Great Britain a hundred years ago, it has been applied with increasing frequency, in recent years particularly, to disputes of nearly every conceivable kind. The cases which it has disposed of have ranged all the way from those involving damage claims of a few thousands of dollars to those more serious controversies, touching territorial limits and transgression against national rights, which have cut deeply the national pride and sense of honor, and given rise to hot and long-continued diplomatic debate. Wherever it has been employed it has succeeded. There is not a real exception to be noted. The cases which it has settled have stayed settled. Not even the ghost of such a case has ever risen to disturb anybody's tranquillity. It has been tried by nearly all nations, great and small, in the Old World and the New, the United States and Great Britain leading, the former with more than sixty cases and the latter with about the same number.

Arbitration has not yet wholly succeeded in preventing wars, and may not for some time yet, but its record, in the hundred years since it again came into use, is a most remarkable one, and some day, when the history of human progress begins to be really written, this record will constitute a very instructive chapter. . . . Arbitration gives time for passion to cool. It affords opportunity to hunt up all the facts in a given case, an ignorance or one-sided knowledge of which is often the chief cause of irritation. It costs a mere pittance compared with war. It carries questions of right and justice to the forum of reason, where only they can be determined according to their merits. True honor is always vindicated before its tribunals. It leaves no bitter ranklings behind, no broken families, no devastated lands, no international feuds. It appeals to the better instincts of peoples. It removes prejudices and misjudgments. It creates sympathy and fellowship. Arbitration is not simply a cool and heartless method of disposing of difficulties; in its deeper significance it is a method of cooperation in promoting the true interests of the nations in their relations to one another. . . . A great arbitration like that of the Alabama dispute or of the Bering Sea seal question settles a whole group of international principles, and thus permanently advances international law. The Bering Sea case is a conspicuous example of the tendency of arbitration to produce peaceful cooperation for the removal of troubles which not even an arbitral court may be able to reach. For these reasons arbitration, through the spirit out of which it springs and which it greatly develops and strengthens, will gradually remove the necessity of employing it at all, and will thus prove a powerful instrument in promoting the federation of the world.

The great question now in connection with this mode of settling differences is to make it permanent, to build it into a judicial system universally recognized and accepted by all

the civilized nations. Toward the accomplishment of this all the agencies of peace are turning. A hundred years is long enough to have successfully experimented. . . . Permanent treaties of arbitration, providing for the setting up of a permanent tribunal, are the great desideratum of our complex, sensitive civilization. All disputes between the civilized nations ought forever hereafter, by their own sovereign and united determination, to be taken out of the realm of passion, caprice and violence, and brought within the domain of reason and law.

—Benjamin F. Trueblood, The Federation of the World, Extracts from pp. 107-112.

## HISTORIC STEPS IN ARBITRATION

When, in 1905, Norway and Sweden peacefully separated, they drew up a treaty in which they agreed to submit all questions, excepting those involving national honor, to arbitration, but they inserted the proviso that the question of honor should also be subject to the arbitrators. By this treaty, Norway and Sweden are saving vast sums of money for social, industrial, and educational benefit that otherwise would have been put into armament. By and by we shall all see what fools we are, and put the millions we are now spending on great, useless hulks, with which to fight fancied enemies, into fighting the only real enemies any nation has to-day, corruption, corporate greed, tuberculosis, typhoid, saloons, and other subtler foes. It is always worth remembering that the money spent in one battleship would build a Harvard University and then leave enough to build a Tuskegee and a Hampton Institute. An arbitration costs perhaps $1,000,000. Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead has called attention to the fact that "Three weeks before Paul Kruger's 'ultimatum' Joseph Chamberlain, British Minister, refused to refer the difficulties to an arbitration board of two Dutch and three British chief justices. Had he done so, England would have saved three years of bitter-

ness, a setback to all local progress and reform, and the hatred of a people who lost 20,000 women and children in concentration camps; she would have saved $1,100,000,000, which might have given that third of England's population who are living in dire poverty on less than six dollars a week per family the following things:

"100 Old People's Homes at $100,000 each.
1,000 Public Playgrounds at $50,000 each.
1,000 Public Libraries at $50,000 each.
1,000 Trade Schools at $200,000 each.
500 Hospitals at $200,000 each.
3,000 Public Schools at $100,000 each.
150,000 Workingmen's Houses at $2,000 each."
—Frederick Lynch, The Peace Problem, pp. 38, 39.

While Chile and the Argentine Republic settled their differences and agreed to disarm, they commemorated the event by uplifting on the summit of the Andes, nearly three miles above the level of the sea, a colossal statue of Christ, the Prince of Peace. They cast it from the bronze of old cannon left there by the Spaniards at the time of the struggle for Argentine's independence. They placed on it this inscription: "Sooner shall these mountains crumble into dust than Chileans or Argentines shall break this peace which, at the feet of Christ the Redeemer, they have sworn to maintain."
—Henry Wade Rogers, The United States and the Peace Movement, in Report of the Third American Peace Congress, p. 376.

In 1911, at the instigation of President Taft, with the cordial assent of Sir Edward Grey and the acclamation of statesmen of all parties in England, an unlimited arbitration treaty was signed at Washington between Great Britain and the United States. This was to have been the precursor of similar treaties of the United States and the other great

powers. Unfortunately the Senate of the United States by a narrow majority refused to accept the treaty. But public opinion is rapidly ripening for such a treaty. Since the Treaty of Ghent, 1814, there has been no war between the two great divisions of the Anglo-Saxon race, and the disputes which might have led to war, having in every case been settled peacefully by arbitration and negotiation, have only served to strengthen the ties of friendship between the sister nations. Not only so, but Great Britain and the United States were parties to the first treaty ever signed for limitation of armaments. In 1815 Monroe, the American Secretary of State, proposed that there should be no armed forces on either side of the United States-Canadian frontier. In 1817 the Rush-Bagot agreement was drawn up, by which Monroe's proposal was made effective, and from that time to this that frontier, of 3,000 miles in length, is without fort or garrison on either side, and there can be no doubt that this absence of armed forces has greatly contributed to the peace between the two nations.

The nineteenth century saw a great advance in international agreement, and its last decade witnessed the first successful attempt to draw all nations together in an international conference for the limitation of armaments and the substitution of arbitration for war. In 1899 the first Hague Conference met. Since that time, while no success has yet attended the efforts after general limitation of armaments, the cause of arbitration has prospered wonderfully. The cases tried by the Hague Tribunal itself have been only twelve (to the end of 1912), but these are only a small proportion of the total number of disputes satisfactorily settled by arbitration since 1900, for in most cases the nations involved have preferred to choose their own arbitrators.

But the Hague Conferences have only begun to do their work. Natural conservatism has viewed limitation of arma-

ments with great suspicion, and the interests that live on armaments in all countries have used their great influence to cause an increase rather than a decrease in military and naval preparation. Nevertheless, public opinion is being educated. At the first Hague Conference, in 1899, twenty-six States were represented; at the second, 1907, forty-four were represented; and preparations are being made in all civilized countries for the third, which shows that both the governments and people are taking it seriously and mean that it shall influence international life. . . . Now that all the machinery of arbitration is ready for use, and hundreds of awards have been made and accepted as just, we may believe that the time is not far distant when nations will be willing unrestrictedly to submit all disputes to impartial tribunals.

—WILLIAM E. WILSON, Christ and War, Extracts from pp. 165-167.

Supposing two of the greatest nations in the world were to make it clear to the whole world that by an agreement of such a character as under no circumstances were they going to war again, I venture to say that the effect on the world at large of the example would be one that would be bound to have beneficent consequences. . . . I have spoken of that because I do not think that a statement of that kind put forward by a man in the position of the President of the United States should go without response. Entering into an agreement of that kind, there would be great risks. It would entail certain risks for us to refer everything to arbitration, and as the President of the United States has said, we must be prepared to take certain risks and to make some sacrifice of national pride. When an agreement of that kind, so sweeping as it is, is proposed to us, we shall be delighted to have such a proposal. But I should feel that it was something so momentous and so far-reaching in its possible consequence that it would

require, not only the signature of both governments, but the deliberate and decided sanction of Parliament, and that, I believe, would be obtained.

—Sir Edward Grey, Quoted in Documents of the American Association for International Conciliation, 1911, Extracts from pp. 7, 8.

When the great step suggested by the President goes into effect we hope—I do—that these two great countries (England and America) will clasp hands in a freer and a more generous trade than they have known in times past. What he proposed that we say to Great Britain, if I interpret it right, is this: We will arbitrate all questions with you, including questions of honor and independence and of vital interest. We know you. You would not, if you could, interfere with our independence. You would not, if you could, disturb our vital interests. And we have no purpose to put a blot upon your honor or blight your interests, or interfere with your independence. We trust you. Will you trust us, and in that mutual trust and confidence leave all questions that can arise between us to a court of arbitration?

There is not one of us here to-night who would vote to arbitrate our independence. If Great Britain said a hundred and fifty years ago, "You are our colonies and you must return and be our colonies again," we would not leave that to the Hague Tribunal. But it is preposterous to think that England would propose such a thing, and therefore it is preposterous to guard against it. We say to Great Britain, "We trust you, and we leave all questions that can arise between us to a judicial tribunal." . . . And when we two nations have done that, then we may well turn to the other nations of the globe, certainly to the other nations of Christendom, and say, "This is our estimate of modern civilization. Great Britain and America are sufficiently civilized to believe that they can

trust each other with all questions of vital interest and honor and independence. Whenever you are sufficiently civilized to take the same stand and repose in us the same trust, we shall like to make the same agreement with you."

—Lyman Abbott, in Report of Third American Peace Congress, 1911, pp. 251, 252.

## HINDRANCE TO ARBITRATION

Arbitration was well defined, if I remember right, by Mr. Holt, who said that it was substituting the appeal to reason for the appeal to force, and whenever that substitution can be made, it must be made. But, if there is no reason you cannot appeal to it. You cannot appeal to reason when facing a pack of wolves. When dynamiters blow up our railroads and homes, you cannot appeal to reason, because they haven't got it. You organize the court not to find out whether it is reasonable to blow up houses and bridges, but to find out if it was done. When marauding bands assail private persons in Turkey and the government stands by and looks on without doing anything, then there is no reason there to appeal to. When the Armenian massacres were going on if one nation had brought a man-of-war up the Dardanelles and told them that the massacres must stop they would have stopped and it would have been the threatening of war that would have stopped them. For one hundred years appeal was made to Spain by the United States in behalf of Cuba, and made in vain. At last forbearance ceased to be a virtue. After from one quarter to one third of Cuba's citizens had been killed, some by secret assassination, some by assault, some by starvation, then this country, having for one hundred years appealed and appealed in vain, appealed by the guns of Samson's fleet and Cuba was made free.

—Lyman Abbott, in Report of Third American Peace Congress, 1911, p. 251.

The difficulty about arguing is that when you get before an audience, everybody is in favor of peace. They are all in favor of peace. But when it comes to an election, the issue as to international peace does not play any part at all. The peace part of the political platform does not seem to affect anybody but the peace societies. And when you say to members of the Senate of the United States, "You are reaching a conclusion in which the people do not stand by you," they say, "Well, what of that? Such an issue never affected a single vote at the election." Now we ought to make it control some votes, so that when a Senator rises in his seat and says, "The Senate has no power to make an obligation of this sort to bind our government to future policy of arbitration," we shall say, "Your constituents differ with you in that regard, and are looking for a Senator who will have a different constitutional view and who will not regard the sacredness of the Senate of the United States against binding itself and the nation to future arbitration as more important than the attribute of full national sovereignty." If we are a nation at all, we must have power to bind ourselves as a nation to contracts that will not only uplift nations but uplift the world; and if we are to be limited by the fact that the Senate of the United States cannot confirm and cannot make a contract of that sort, then we have hobbled ourselves and our national sovereignty in the possibility of progress toward a higher and a more Christian civilization.

—William Howard Taft, The Time to Test Our Faith in Arbitration, in Documents of The American Association for International Conciliation, 1913, Extracts from pp, 7, 8.

Much of the disappointment at the comparative ineffectiveness of the Hague Court has arisen from a lack of comprehension of this fundamental distinction between the arbitra-

tion of legal cases and the arbitration of political cases. It has proved its success in settling questions of law or fact; it cannot be expected to take over at once the settlement of the delicate modern questions that involve the "vital interests" and "honor" of disputing nations. In fact, it is more important that a large body of international law and procedure should be built up than it is that its work should run the risk of being ruined by a false move in attempting to settle questions of policy which can, at the present time, be better settled in the chancelleries of Europe. The value of arbitration has been in the past and will be for a long time to come the determination of law. The skillful arbitrator will look more to the formulation of a sound principle of international law and the practical and fruitful application of some recognized principle than he will to the adjustment of immediate irritations.

—Randolph S. Bourne, Arbitration and International Politics, pp. 7, 8, in The Documents of the American Association for International Conciliation, 1913.

Three incidents have occurred since the Hague Court was organized which have caused much pain to the friends of peace throughout the world:

America refused the offer of the Filipinos to adjust their quarrel by arbitration. Britain refused the offer of the Transvaal Republic to arbitrate, although three of the Court proposed by the Republic were to be British Judges, and the other two Judges of Holland—the most remarkable offer ever made, highly creditable to the maker and a great tribute to British Judges. Neither Russia nor Japan suggested submission to The Hague. Since the Hague Court is the result of the Russian Emperor's initiative, this caused equal surprise and pain. The explanation has been suggested that peaceful

conferences were being held when Japan attacked at Port Arthur without notice, rendering arbitration impossible.

—ANDREW CARNEGIE, A League of Peace, p. 25, in the Documents of the American Association for International Conciliation, 1907-08.

## ARBITRATION VS. ARMAMENTS

There is a broad distinction between proposals for disarmament and proposals for the limitation of armaments. When a nation like the United States, holding the views which its people profess and which its government constantly voices, has, as it now has, a navy and the nucleus of an army entirely adequate for purposes of defense, a stop should be put to the further increase of armaments. It is urged in opposition that no nation can afford to take this step alone and that until an international agreement for the limitation of armaments is arrived at, each great nation must press forward, at whatever cost, to multiply the provisions for its armed forces. However plausible this argument may be when addressed to a European nation, it fails entirely when addressed to the United States. If the best way to resume was to resume—and we learned by experience in 1879 that it was—then the best way to limit armaments is to limit them. In this policy the United States has not only nothing to lose, but everything to gain, by leading the way. It is no small satisfaction to point out that increasing support for this view is to be found in the public opinion of the country, reflected both in the debates and votes in the Congress as well as in the more influential portion of the newspaper press. . . .

Great as are the advantages of an International Court of Prize, the fact must not be overlooked that the very existence of such an institution presupposes war; for its purpose is to decide controversies arising because of alleged illegal captures

in time of war. The International Court of Arbitral Justice, on the other hand, has for its purpose the settlement of controversies and differences which arise in time of peace, and which, when settled and determined, may avert hostility and war. It will be remembered that at the second Hague Conference the proposal of the United States in regard to the establishment of this Court was accepted in principle, and that a draft convention was adopted regulating its organization, jurisdiction, and procedure; but that the definitive constitution of the Court was not agreed upon because the Conference failed to hit upon a method of selecting the judges that was acceptable to all of the nations represented.

—Nicholas Murray Butler, The International Mind, Extracts from pp. 62-88. (Used by Permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.)

With the growth of the burdens, grows more ardent also the wish of the peoples that tribunals may be established through which conflicts of arms may be banished from the world. In fact scarcely a year passes by in which there is not an actual decision by such a tribunal, showing how easily this way may be entered upon where the wish to do so exists, and that it also reaches the desired goal. In the way of treaties for the establishment of arbitral union between nations is progress also being made, not only here in your land, but we hope also that your invitation and appeal to the European States has not fallen upon unfruitful soil. Indeed, in military Germany the friends of peace succeeded in the Reichstag in securing the insertion in the new commercial treaties concluded a few years ago of a clause providing that all difficulties arising in connection with them should be settled by arbitration.

—Adolph Richter, in Report of Fifth Universal Peace Congress, p. 116.

In connection with Sir Edward Grey's arbitration pro-

posals, attention might be drawn to the statement often made by militarists that the expansion of armaments is necessary to "insure peace"; that big armies and navies are the insurance premiums of peace, and that ruinous competition of armaments can be defended on the theory that to insure peace a nation must be prepared for war. The recently published views of Colonel Gädke, himself a German military man and a critic of acknowledged authority, are interesting on this point: "It is only partly true that armaments are the insurance premiums of peace. With better right they might be called a constant menace to peace. At any rate, they have become a monstrous burden for the people. The most progressive and the greatest states are precisely those which suffer most under this burden."

That armaments have become "a monstrous burden" is certainly a fact. In the last ten years (1900-1909) Germany has spent about twenty-five hundred and Great Britain more than three thousand million dollars for their army and navy. If things go on at the present rate, by the end of the decade that has just begun (1910-1919), the two peoples will each have sacrificed thirty-five hundred or four thousand hundred millions of dollars to the Moloch of war preparations.

Despite the assurances of ministers and diplomatists that the foreign relations of the states are perfectly friendly, there is in the hearts of the people the thought of war, solely because their governments continually extend their preparations for hostilities. Colonel Gädke, as a military expert, realizes the full extent of the danger to which this state of affairs must lead, and says: "Nothing but binding agreements between the nations can avert, in a peaceful manner, the dangers that are ceaselessly lying in wait for us; treaties are remedies which work gradually for an assured peace among civilized nations."

Thus armed preparation in peace time leads inevitably to

that mutual distrust which, as Von Moltke said in the Reichstag many years ago, "is what keeps the nations in arms against one another," and finally leads to war.

—Syndicates for War, New York Evening Post.

## WORK OF THE PEACE CONFERENCES

At the weekly reception to diplomatic representatives by Count Muravev, the Russian foreign minister, at Saint Petersburg (now Petrograd), on August 24, 1898, the count handed to ambassadors and ministers a rescript from the Emperor, which said, "The maintenance of general peace, and a possible reduction of the excessive armaments which weigh upon all nations, present themselves in the existing condition of the whole world as the ideal toward which the endeavors of all governments should be directed."

After detailing the "calamities which are threatening the whole world," the rescript, written by the late Frederic de Martens and presented by Count Muravev, continued: "His Majesty has been pleased to order me to propose to all the governments whose representatives are accredited to the Imperial Court, the meeting of a conference which would have to occupy itself with this grave problem."

The proposal met with a general response, and on January 11, 1899, Count Muravev issued another circular note, in which he stated that "the Imperial Cabinet has been able to collect with lively satisfaction evidence of the warmest approval which has reached it, and continues to be received, from all classes of society in various parts of the globe."

The Hague was selected as the meeting place of the Conference, and on May 18, 1899, in the Royal House in the Wood, there convened the delegates of twenty-six powers, to carry out the program. The conference continued its sessions until July 29, on which date a final act and the documents indicated below were signed as the result of the deliberations:

I. Convention concerning the pacific settlement of international disputes.

II. Convention concerning the laws and customs of war on land.

III. Convention concerning the adaptation to maritime warfare of the principles of the Geneva Convention of August 22, 1864.

IV. 1°. Declaration prohibiting the throwing of projectiles from balloons or other analogous means.

2°. Declaration prohibiting the use of projectiles having as their sole object the diffusion of asphyxiating or deleterious gases.

3°. Declaration prohibiting the use of bullets which expand or flatten easily in the human body.

Little that was distinctly new in international affairs is to be found in these documents, which established in a formal way much that had been tried frequently and successfully, though casually, in practical international affairs. In general, the conventions were the codification of law already existing; but, particularly in the case of means for the pacific settlement of international disputes, the necessary machinery for the practical use of mediation, commissions of inquiry and arbitration was provided. The first Hague Conference made the employment of methods already known simple and practical.

## THE SECOND CONFERENCE

No provision was made in 1899 for a second conference except the voting of a wish that the Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of Sick and Wounded might be revised at a special conference, and the expression of other wishes which might be referred to "a subsequent conference." At Saint Louis in 1904 the annual meeting of the Interparliamentary

Union, composed of members of the majority of the parliaments of the powers, passed a resolution requesting "the President of the United States to invite all the nations to send representatives to such a second conference." Secretary of State John Hay issued the proposal on instructions from President Roosevelt in a circular note of October 21, 1904, addressed to the participants in the First Conference. The Peace of Portsmouth closing the Russo-Japanese War was signed on September 5, 1905; and since there was a feeling in some quarters that the Russian Emperor as the initiator of the First Conference should take the lead in respect to the second, on September 13, 1905, the formal Russian proposal was made. The test which the recent war had given to the provisions of the military conventions had indicated numerous points at which they might be improved and suggested other points on which it was desirable to have agreement. The Russian Government concerned itself with preparing a program and proceeded to invite all sovereign countries to the conference.

The opening session of the Second Conference was held in the Hall of the Knights, at The Hague, on June 15, 1907, and the Conference adjourned on October 18. The larger number of States concerned, the larger amount of business transacted, and the more controversial character of the problems met and solved, amply justified the greater length of the Conference. All the sovereign governments of the world participated, with the exception of Abyssinia, Costa Rica, and Honduras, forty-four in all.

The holding of the First Conference had crystallized the ideas of publicists upon questions of international law capable of reduction to definite rules. The Second Conference was characterized by its practical attack upon international problems and by the extent of its accomplishments. The Conventions signed are indicated below:

I. Pacific settlement of international disputes.

II. Limitation of the employment of force for the recovery of contract debts.

III. Relative to opening of hostilities.

IV. Laws and customs of war on land.

V. Rights and duties of neutral powers and persons in case of war on land.

VI. Status of enemy merchant ships at the outbreak of hostilities.

VII. Conversion of merchant ships into warships.

VIII. Laying automatic submarine contact mines.

IX. Bombardment by naval forces in time of war.

X. Adaptation to naval war of the principles of the Geneva Convention.

XI. Certain restrictions with regard to the exercise of the right of capture in naval war.

XII. Creation of an international prize court.

XIII. Rights and duties of neutral powers in naval war.

XIV. Declaration prohibiting the discharge of projectiles and explosives from balloons.

XV. Final act. —Denys P. Myers.

**PERMANENT TRIBUNAL**

The Second Hague Peace Conference, which met on June 15 and adjourned on October 18, 1907, approved, among other projects, an exceedingly important convention for the establishment of a Court of Arbitral Justice and recommended that the Court be instituted and put in operation as soon as an agreement could be reached by the Powers, through diplomatic channels, upon the appointment of the judges. The significance of this action lay in the fact that for the first time in the world's history the representatives of forty-four civilized nations, assembled in conference, recognized not merely the value of a judicial decision of international

disputes which diplomacy may have failed to adjust, but the inestimable advantages that would inevitably flow from a determination of international controversies by a body of trained lawyers, appointed for a period of years and permanently in session, and acting under a sense of judicial responsibility. By this action the solidarity of nations, to use a phrase which has recently come into use, was transferred from the realm of theory to the domain of fact, and justice between nations was declared to be of interest not merely to the nations in controversy, but to all members of the society of nations recognizing and applying in their intercourse the principles of international law.

—James Brown Scott, The Court of Arbitral Justice, Extracts from pp. 3, 4, in Judicial Settlement of International Disputes, 1910-12.

If there could be any assurance that the Powers could be relied upon to allow serious causes of quarrel to be adjudicated by the permanent tribunal of The Hague, created at the second conference in 1907, there would be little reason to fear for the world's peace. As matters stand to-day, the weak point of the system is that no Power, or no great Power, is bound, or even pledged by its own promise, to submit serious disputes to arbitration. It was hoped that the Second Hague Conference would result in some common and binding agreement in this respect. Perhaps the time was not ripe. All that was done was to put on record a solemn declaration in favor of compulsory arbitration and to renew the standing invitation to individual Powers to enter into treaties with each other in favor of arbitration.

—Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, International Arbitration, Extract from p. 10, in Documents of The American Association for International Conciliation, 1911.

In an address on the next Hague Peace Conference, delivered before the London School of Economics on October 5, 1912, Lord Justice Kennedy said, as reported by the London Times:

"The objective was the establishment of a Court which should be a real judicial tribunal; which by its character should command the respect and by the moral weight of its judgments compel the obedience even of the most powerful and warlike nations. He did not mean a temporary Board of Arbitration, but a permanent Court of Justice. That was the most hopeful, if not the only way in which there would be gradually evolved in the civilized world a recognized system of international law. He could see no insuperable difficulty to the formation or working of such a Court. The position of its Judges would be one of the highest in the world. If all the conferring Powers would subscribe among themselves, he supposed the cost would not amount to that of a single modern battleship."

—James Brown Scott, The Court of Arbitral Justice, Extracts from pp. 11, 12, in Judicial Settlement of International Disputes, 1910-12.

According as arbitration fulfills one or the other of its functions, the rôle of the arbitrator differs and the significance of the award varies. The value of arbitration as an instrument of law depends above all on the award because it determines legality. The arbitrator ought to be made to feel that peace does not depend upon his decision. He may, and legally he should, say without ulterior motive, "Let justice be done"; he should fix his attention less on the adjustment of difficulties than on the practical application of the law.

As an instrument of peace, on the other hand, arbitration has value by virtue of its very spirit, that is, because of the

pacific intention of the States that employ it. In serious controversies, involving national pride, arbitration has a calming effect. That effect results from compromise. The moment an agreement to resort to arbitration is reached, discussions become useless and recriminations lose their object. Moreover, the award is then only of secondary interest. So much so that what one expects from it is simply to confirm the desire for peace which is already manifested by the "compromise" or conditions of the arbitration. The arbitrator should concern himself with justifying the confidence reposed in him by the parties to the controversy, with rounding the angles and with couching his award in prudent language which will not offend the susceptibilities of either party.

Each of these offices of arbitration has its own domain, that of justice being limited to controversies of a juridical character, that of peace to controversies of a political character. This distinction is important because, if it leaves its proper domain, each runs the risk of failing in the effect which one has a right to expect of it. To employ pacific arbitration in legal controversies is to interpret falsely the conception of justice. To resort to judicial arbitration in political controversies is to endanger the maintenance of peace.

—N. Politis, The Work of the Hague Court, Extract from pp. 9-11, in Judicial Settlement of International Disputes, 1910-12.

The spread of international arbitration depends, after the progress of common sense, more upon the ever-expanding empire of law, order, and commerce than upon anything else; and undoubtedly, since the days of Montesquieu, not only have divergent systems of justice and law in all civilized countries been brought nearer, and many imperfections re-

moved, but the principles of public and private jurisprudence have been sufficiently ascertained and agreed, to warrant us in expecting rapid and fruitful developments of international justice.

—Francis W. Hirst, The Arbiter in Council, Extracts from pp. 350, 351.

The organization of an international judicial system goes steadily on. The auspicious settlement of the differences between Great Britain and the United States in regard to the Newfoundland Fisheries, by their submission to the International Court of Arbitration at The Hague, was at once a long step forward in international practice and an example which has not been without its effect upon the public opinion of other nations. It must not be forgotten that an International Court of Prize was created by the Second Hague Conference, and that the same body, composed of accredited representatives from forty-four different nations, recommended the establishment of an International Court of Arbitral Justice. So soon as these two Courts shall be put into operation at The Hague a permanent international judiciary will have been created—one capable of hearing and deciding any and every controversy of a justiciable character which may arise between nations either in time of peace or because of the existence of a state of war.

The convention for the establishment of the International Court of Prize has been approved by thirty-four nations. Despite this fact, the Court has not yet been instituted. Various objections have been made to its institution as planned, and to overcome these objections no little time, patience, and diplomatic skill have been necessary.

—Nicholas Murray Butler, American Association for International Conciliation, 1911, Extracts from pp. 13, 14.

To very many persons Peace advocacy appears as made up in part by a recoil from the sacrifice of lives, which, however, is considerably less than that which he sees going on around him every day in the interest merely of material wealth—a sacrifice which in that case excites no protest; and in part by disparagement of such things as national safety and honor, which he regards as of infinitely greater worth than the industries and commerce which take a heavier toll of life than does war. And consequently, looking at what would be achieved by the change and what is jeopardized by it, he opposes to all ideas which seem even remotely to be concerned with schemes of international peace, either a ferocious hostility which he feels ought to be excited by all doctrines that imply indifference to this country's safety and interests, or a tolerant contempt which he would mete out to all sentimental or academic futility, just as five hundred years ago, he dismissed the "theories" of Galileo with some reference to everybody standing on their heads, and fifty years ago the theories of Darwin by some reference to monkeys and their tails.

May I say that, if the case for Pacifism were what I have just indicated, if really its object were merely the avoidance of suffering, to be obtained at the price of national jeopardy, his attitude would be entirely justified; and I hope you will not think me callous if I say that did Pacifism offer nothing more than the mere avoidance of that physical suffering which war involves, you would not find me here to-night. Because the word "peace" generally connotes this narrow objective, and leaves aside altogether what is really implied in our attempt to correct what we believe to be very deep-seated errors in human relationship, I almost wish that that word could never be used. Just as Galileo knew that the real justification of his attempt to correct prevailing error was not a trivial point as to the exact place or shape of the planet on

which we live, but the right understanding of the physical universe, its laws and nature; so do we know that our case is bound up with the destruction of misconceptions which distort and falsify the fundamental principles on which human society is based.

—Norman Angell, Arms and Industry, Extract from pp. 5, 6. (G. P. Putnam's Sons, Publishers.)

With the twentieth century mankind has entered on a new era. During a long course of years nations have become familiarized to the settlement of differences between them by means of arbitration. But international arbitration is a rough measure of justice. Too much is left to the discretion of the arbitrators. Too much is ordinarily left to their prejudices. In the usual tribunal constituted for this purpose, each of the nations which are parties to the controversy names one of the arbitrators, and his fellow citizens generally expect him to vote in its favor when the decision is to be made. On the other hand, the umpire, or if there be one arbitrator, the person who fills that position, is strongly tempted to assume the position of a mediator rather than that of a judge. . . .

History furnishes illustrations of the difference between an award of arbitrators and a judicial decision.

A judicial tribunal proceeds by certain definite rules. There are, in the normal condition of things, a plaintiff and a defendant. The plaintiff has the duty of proving his case. If he does not prove it, the judgment must go for the defendant. If the question be one of title to land, the plaintiff must recover, if at all, on the strength of his own title, not the weakness of the defendant's. So if either party is able to show that the point in dispute has been settled by some authority to which it was previously referred, he prevails on the principle of *res adjudicata*. The thing having been

already adjudged the former judgment is conclusive. An arbitrator may adopt these rules: a judge must.

—Simeon E. Baldwin, Judicial Settlement of International Disputes, Extracts from pp. 3-7.

Looking from the Hague Conferences onward, we think we can see clearly five steps in the coming organization:

*First.* The International Court of Justice, already existing in embryo, and even in that condition with more than a dozen international quarrels settled by it; but not such a court as now, summoned with difficulty and only at pleasure of disputants—not that, but one in permanent session, with regular procedure, and regular judges, and easy of access. The nations, meanwhile, are making treaties of pledge with each other to refer to its final adjudication their questions of difference—even those involving "honor and vital interests," if President Taft has his way.

*Second.* An International Congress, like the present Interparliamentary Union, but official, with regular sessions, and with members delegated by the nations to represent them; its work to be the discussion and shaping and recommendation of measures that make for the common weal of the world.

*Third.* A Code of International Laws, gradually evolved from the decisions of the International Court and the recommendations of the International Congress. David Jayne Hill reminds us that "the price of a single battleship has never yet been expended *by all the nations of the earth combined* for the judicial organization of peace." Folly? Yes; and what in such matter was folly yesterday and insanity to-day is to-morrow criminality. If ten Powers—England, France, Germany, Russia, Austria-Hungary, Italy, the United States, the South American Republics as a group, China, Japan—were to contribute each *one tenth* of a battleship's cost to endow at The Hague the Arbitral Court of the Nations and

a Commission on the Codification of World Law, that one tenth apiece would save whole fleets of battleships on the seas, and promote more happiness on the earth than probably any other million which any of those nations ever has spent, or could spend to-day.

*Fourth.* The Establishment of an International Police—an international army and navy, with constituents furnished by nations in league for the purpose; at first by a few, and then by more; at first having very limited and then with widening functions, all under treaty arrangements. A police system is needed by the world, and, until something international of the kind is created, it is hard to see how, with the nations under present conditions of distrust, disarmament on any large scale can be effected. It may not be so far off as we think, the day for this international police in place of the separate armies and navies with their ruinous cost. Even Sir Edward Grey, in responding to President Taft's proposal, ventured to predict it.

*Fifth.* An International Protectorate; that is, the employment of the joint public opinion of the nations thus organized, and, when necessary, employment of the International Police, as a protection against national crimes. Under such a protectorate we may look for a great extension of three international methods of maintaining peace in the world—Mediation, Intervention, and the Neutralization of nations and territories.

Call this a dream, if you will. The soldiers will. Half the diplomatists will. Politicians will, unless they are statesmen. Many, not all, of the business men will. *Most* of us will. But some of us will add, "A dream that is even now beginning to come true, and which the twentieth century will carry far toward fulfillment." The years will decide.

—William C. Gannett, International Good-Will as a Substitute for Armies and Navies.

The greater bulk of the international statute law written at The Hague has dealt with the prospect of war or its conduct. This is not surprising, since that abnormal condition of the modern state must, by reason of its abnormality, be more clearly limited and defined than the condition of peace, in which problems are far more diverse and usually not of equally critical character. The third Conference—if it takes place under conditions similar to its predecessors and is not superseded by a closer international federative body—will inevitably make additions to the statute law of war, and for the first time will probably take long steps toward codifying the regulation of peaceful relations between nations.

It is the Hague Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes which has been most in the public eye and by which the work at The Hague has been publicly judged. This Convention consists of four constructive parts relating to the maintenance of general peace, good offices and mediation, international commissions of inquiry, and international arbitration. The extent to which these methods have been used is the test of the Convention. The first part is declaratory that "the contracting powers agree to use their best efforts to insure the pacific settlement of international differences." The part referring to good offices and mediation relates to the proffering of assistance by a third party respecting differences between two states. It is provided that "the exercise of this right can never be regarded by either of the parties in dispute as an unfriendly act." The provisions of this part have found their application since 1899 in many instances of international strained feeling. The mediation of the United States in Central and South America has several times resulted in smoothing over serious difficulties; and at a more recent period the European powers were acting as mediators under this convention throughout almost the whole course of the Turko-Italian War and throughout all of

the Turko-Balkan and Inter-Balkan conflicts. It is generally accepted in diplomatic circles that this mediation facilitated peace negotiations and hastened their conclusion. The success of mediation by Brazil, Argentina, and Chile in the Mexican difficulty in the spring of 1914, saving the United States from a threatened war, is perhaps in itself a complete justification of this part of the Convention. The European war came about only after the failure of several mediation proposals and had hardly begun before President Wilson had tendered his good offices.

The part referring to international commissions of inquiry was intended to set up machinery "to facilitate a solution of disputes by elucidating the facts by means of an impartial and conscientious investigation." It is not intended to pass on the quality of facts and actions, but simply to determine what actually occurred. Twice this machinery has been availed of, both times successfully.

The part of the Convention referring to international arbitration is the one most generally known. It provides for arbitration at The Hague, establishes technical rules therefor, provides a bureau corresponding to the familiar office of clerk of court, and lays down general rules for the selection of judges. Choice of arbitrators is now rather clumsy, and the American project for a Judicial Arbitral Court brought up at the Second Conference was designed to remedy this by providing a court holding regular sessions. At present "each contracting power selects four persons at the most, of known competency in questions of international law, of the highest moral reputation, and disposed to accept the duties of arbitrator." These persons form the so-called Permanent Court, in reality a panel of judges. When states have a question to arbitrate the arbitrators are chosen from the list of this panel, three or five members being named by a method previously agreed upon. One is designated president, and the court so

constituted hears the case and renders the decision. The court was declared formed by a note of the Dutch Minister of Foreign Affairs of April 9, 1901, a little more than thirteen years ago. From that date to May 22, 1902, it awaited business. From then until the present time business has always been pending before the court in some stage, except the period from August 8, 1905, to March 14, 1908.

—Denys P. Myers.

## CHAPTER VII

## THE INTERDEPENDENCE OF THE NATIONS

No nation liveth to itself alone in the Twentieth Century.
—George E. Roberts.

### INTERDEPENDENCE—A REALITY TO-DAY

Any species of birds that will not fly together as they fly South shall all lose their way; any flock of sheep that cannot stand together in a winter's storm all perish. Any utterly selfish species must die out as the world unfolds and develops. Deeper than any possible battle of group with group is the law that the group that will not stand with the other groups shall ultimately lose its chance in the unfolding cosmic order.
—W. H. P. Faunce.

Human rights, national integrity, and opportunity against material interests—that is the issue which we now have to face. —Woodrow Wilson.

The craftsmen of every land are finding out that their interests are common; they are beginning to realize that it is madness to seek to destroy and ruin each other. The educated people, and especially the men of science, have long known this. By interchange of periodicals, by frequent international visits, by the actions of great societies, and by making use everywhere of all knowledge wherever it be acquired, they have long practically realized the solidarity of humanity; and, in spite of such political hostilities as are forced upon their notice, their attitude to all coworkers is necessarily and

essentially one of fellow-feeling, sympathy, mutual admiration, and brotherhood. No warlike enthusiasm is needed, no alien excitement is called for, to break the monotony of scientific work. In work such as this there is no monotony: excitement and thrill are provided by the prospect of a discovery. There is plenty of room also for effort and strenuous exertion. There are dangers, too, to be encountered, dangers of disease and accident—witness the self-sacrifice of many an investigator, whether he be a geographical explorer, or an X-ray worker, or a student of tropical disease. There is very little monotonous toil, though there is much steady work. An eruption of barbarism would be no relief; it would be a discord, an interruption as painful and perturbing as an earthquake.

It is the deadly monotony of the ordinary life of the multitude that constitutes a civic, a national, danger. It is this that drives people to drink and unworthy relaxation. It is this that makes people welcome the feverish excitement of a catastrophe or of the imminence of war. It is this which is responsible for much of the gambling that goes on. The deadly monotony must be broken, daily life must be made more interesting, work more joyous, human nature must be given a fair chance of equable development. The nation which first realizes the magnitude of the opportunity afforded by earthly existence, and the responsibility resting upon these who cooperatively waste it in the mere apparatus and material of bodily life, the nation which by social reform liberates the spirit of humanity—that nation will arouse in its citizens a fervor of patriotism hitherto unknown, and to it will belong, not by military conquest but by divine right, the supremacy of the future and the gratitude of the human race.

—Sir Oliver Lodge, The Irrationality of War, pp. 13, 14, in Documents of The American Association for International Conciliation, 1912.

Any great city like New York or London, in the advanced state of social development which such a city implies, is always within a week of starvation if suddenly cut off from the rest of the world. Every clime and every industry contributes daily to the supply of its needs. It raises not a bushel of wheat, not a load of corn. It fats no beeves or swine. It produces not a ton of coal, not a board of lumber. The wool and cotton which it uses are grown far away from its borders. When the cars cease to come in from the suburban gardens, the trains of freight to thunder into its stations, or the boats of merchandise to drop anchor in its harbor, it becomes at once as helpless as a child, and begins to cry out for the breast of the great world-mother. A strike on a modern street-car line deranges the plans of every home in a city; a strike on a great railway system throws every corner of the land into confusion.

This interlacing and interdependence of individuals, of families, of communities and of classes, in every relation of life, might be traced out, with interest and profit, *ad libitum*. But the lesson is as clear from the cases given as it could be made by any multiplication of the number. The curious thing about this fact is that men in their normal condition create, spontaneously and intentionally, by the very necessities of their nature, the conditions which, while making them infinitely stronger and more prosperous when united with their fellow-men, render them more and more helpless when left to themselves.

—Benjamin F. Trueblood, The Federation of the World, Extract from pp. 11-13.

If a cross-section showing a single day in the life of a civilized man could be exposed, it would disclose the services of a multitude of helpers. When he rises, a sponge is placed in his hand by a Pacific Islander, a cake of soap by a French-

man, a rough towel by a Turk. His merino underwear he takes from the hand of a Spaniard, his linen from a Belfast manufacturer, his outer garments from a Birmingham weaver, his scarf from a French silk-grower, his shoes from a Brazilian grazier. At breakfast, his cup of coffee is poured by natives of Java and Arabia; his rolls are passed by a Kansas farmer, his beefsteak by a Texan ranchman, his orange by a Florida Negro. He is taken to the city by the descendants of James Watt; his messages are carried hither and thither by Edison, the grandson by electrical consanguinity of Benjamin Franklin; his day's stint of work is done for him by a thousand Irishmen in his factory; or he pleads in a court which was founded by ancient Romans, and for the support of which all citizens are taxed; or in his study at home he reads books composed by English historians and French scientists, and which were printed by the typographical descendants of Gutenberg. In the evening he is entertained by German singers who repeat the myths of Norsemen, or by a company of actors who render the plays of Shakespeare; and, finally, he is put to bed by South Americans who bring hair, by Pennsylvania miners and furnace-workers who bring steel, by Mississippi planters who bring cotton, or, if he prefers, by Russian peasants who bring flax, and by Labrador fowlers who smooth his pillow. A million men, women, and children have been working for him that he may have his day of comfort and pleasure. In return he has contributed his mite to add a unit to the common stock of necessaries and luxuries from which the world draws. Each is working for all; all are working for each. When Robert Louis Stevenson was living near a deserted mine in the heart of the California mountains, it was almost impossible to get fresh meat and milk; and in his sketch entitled "The Silverado Squatters" he observes parenthetically that "it is really disheartening how we depend on other people in this life." Man is never

separate from mankind. It has been truly said that no comparison can be made between man alone and society, but only between man in early and later stages of social development.

—George Harris, Moral Evolution, pp. 36, 37.

### THE GROWTH OF INTERDEPENDENCE DESIRABLE

Here are two tribes of one hundred men each living on opposite sides of a river, both engaged in growing corn or some other simple form of agriculture. It occurs one day to one of the tribes that it would be much simpler to go and take the corn of the other tribe than to labor at growing corn themselves. So some fifty of the best-trained men sally forth to despoil their neighbors. The second tribe resists: some of the fifty are killed, a portion of the corn is captured. The first tribe then argues that they did not employ force enough, and they begin to increase the number of their fighting men and, by definite training, their efficiency. The second tribe, determined not again to be the victims of spoliation, does the same, and you start a competition of armaments, with this result, that at the next foray, you find seventy-five men of the first tribe ranged in battle against the seventy-five of the second. We will assume that the first tribe is successful, beats the seventy-five of the defenders—who, like themselves, have been devoting their energies to warlike training, and not to the production of grain—and as the result of their victory they capture grain produced by twenty-five men. Thus, the result of labor (in warlike preparations, the production of weapons, training, etc.) of seventy-five men yields the amount of wealth represented by the labor of twenty-five men. Would not the result have been exactly three times as great if their force had been turned directly against Nature instead of using it against men?

—Norman Angell, Arms and Industry, Extract from pp. 15, 16. (G. P. Putnam's Sons, Publishers.)

Even if a nation supposes that it can act as it pleases inside its own limits, it finds its mistake if it passes beyond a certain line which the sensibilities or common sense of outside nations regard as the limit of conduct to be tolerated. Spain in Cuba is a sufficient illustration for the people of this country, while the condemnation of the European governments by the outraged sentiment of Christendom for failing to prevent the massacres of the Armenians illustrates what would have been the verdict of civilization if those unspeakable horrors had been stopped by force. Slave traders and pirates are recognized as common enemies of mankind, and slave-trading and piratical peoples, as in the case of Arabs in equatorial Africa and the Mediterranean pirates of the early days of the American republic, can, in so far as their deeds offend the common conscience of other nations, be rightfully deprived of sovereign powers at the will of these nations, with no claim to redress.

When we come to examine thus the positions already held by civilized nations, it is clear that they practically recognize material encroachments upon the principle of national sovereignty. In order to secure assent to a position essential to successful world organization, a further clearing up of ideas rather than any radical change is the need of the hour. Common conditions imposed upon all nations make their status substantially the same in their relation to each other. *Each people exercises a limiting and conditioning influence upon every other people. Each people must recognize conditions which every other must recognize.* It is for the common good that these conditions be submitted to.

It is somewhat with nations as it is with men. Nations are sovereign; men are free. But the recognized limitations upon the free action of men are no more real than the limitations upon the sovereignty of nations. From the savage up to the highest product of civilization, the individual man,

with a will truly free, is yet so limited by circumstances that his freedom is rather a freedom of choice between right and wrong than full freedom of choice regarding the acts of life.

—Raymond L. Bridgman, World Organization, pp. 8, 9.

The one postulate of the principle we are discussing is that variety of the types of civilization among mankind—rather than the universal prevalence of a single type, the others being suppressed—is desirable, and not only desirable, but the ethical aim toward which the efforts of the genuine lovers of progress should be bent. It may seem strange that a proposition of this kind requires to be emphasized; and yet this is undoubtedly necessary in view of the tendencies now clearly prevailing in the opposite direction. Surely the interdependence of the different species of culture is a patent fact. Surely the reciprocal influence of French, Italian, English, German culture on each other is obvious to the most casual student of history.

—Felix Adler, The Fundamental Principle of Inter-Racial Ethics, and Some Practical Applications of it, in Inter-Racial Problems, p. 265.

Though we talk of foreign nations, there are in fact no "foreign" nations. So inextricably interwoven are the interests of different countries that, as Lord Avebury puts it, "if one suffers, all suffer; if one flourishes, it is good for the rest." . . . National policy may often fall below, but it cannot rise above the national Ideal. Thus, however the question is approached, we are always brought back to the same point. And that point is, the urgent necessity of a *changed standard of thought and feeling.*

The wonderful efficacy of changed national sentiment in

promoting friendly relations is constantly before our eyes. Take the case of England and France. After some seven hundred years of warfare, France had come to be thought the traditional, the so-called "natural," enemy of England. She might be so now, but for the genius of Edward the Peacemaker, who—without ever seeming to be so engaged—simply reversed the currents of feeling in both nations, and set them running in a new direction of goodwill and amity, which has every promise of permanence. The genius who does the same for the present relations between Germany and England will deserve the gratitude of Europe.

—W. L. Grane, The Passing of War, Extracts from pp. 231, 232. (The Macmillan Co., Publishers.)

Peace, commerce, friendship with all nations, entangling alliance with none.

—Thomas Jefferson.

What is the real guarantee of the good behavior of one State to another? It is the elaborate interdependence, which, not only in the economic sense, but in every sense, makes an unwarrantable aggression of one State upon another react upon the interests of the aggressor. Switzerland has every interest in affording an absolutely secure asylum to British subjects; that fact, and not the might of the British Empire, gives protection to British subjects in Switzerland. Where, indeed, the British subject has to depend upon the force of his government for protection, it is a very frail protection indeed, because in practice the use of that force is so cumbersome, so difficult, so costly, that any other means are to be preferred to it. When the traveler in Greece had to depend upon British arms, great as was relatively the force of those arms, it proved but a very frail protection. In the same way, when physical force was used to impose on the South American

and Central American States the observance of their financial obligations, such an attempt failed utterly and miserably—so miserably that Great Britain finally surrendered any attempt at such enforcement. What means have succeeded? The bringing of those countries under the influence of the great economic currents of our time, so that now property is infinitely more secure in Argentina than it was when British gunboats were bombarding its ports. More and more in international relationship is the purely economic motive—and the economic motive is only one of several possible ones—being employed to replace the use of physical force.

—Norman Angell, The Great Illusion, pp. 302, 303.
(G. P. Putnam's Sons, Publishers.)

**CHANGING CONDITIONS**

The revolution in the economic and therefore in the political state of the world in the past century, or rather in the last two or three centuries, has been so gradual as to be almost imperceptible, but if one looks back to the conditions prevailing even within the memory of living men and contrasts them with those of to-day one appreciates the really wonderful and striking changes that have been evolved. As recently as a century ago production was on a limited scale, and practically everyone with but few privileged exceptions had to labor from dawn to dark for an income which did not much more than keep body and soul together. Moreover, the pressure of existence made everyone not only jealous for his own welfare but regard with fear any measure that seemed likely to bring benefits to others. But if the jealousy of individuals was great it was small in comparison with the jealousy of nations. The strenuous economic conditions of the time caused nations to regard even the interchange of goods and produce with other states as opposed to their interests. The cause of the insular attitude of country to country, of district

to district, and of man to man was inherent in the economic conditions which then prevailed.

—Sir George Paish, International Investments and Their Important Influence Upon International Unity, p. 49, in Documents of the American Association for International Conciliation, 1912.

The interdependence of nations was first argued seriously in the modern world by Hume in 1752. He was followed by Adam Smith in a work of far wider reach, thirty years later. Yet their arguments had evidently not affected general policy at the end of the eighteenth century, as political discussion in England at the time of the American Revolution, and on the Continent at the time of the Napoleonic wars, showed plainly enough. Indeed the practical, vital interdependence of States was then very small, as the results of Napoleon's continental system clearly showed. Even England, industrially the most developed of all, was only dependent upon foreigners (except occasionally in years of great scarcity) for luxuries, spices, wines, brandies, silks—things which, while the trade in them was considerable, affected only an infinitesimal part of the population, and which were not much affected by the prosperity or otherwise of the neighboring peoples. England had not yet a great national industry which depended upon the prosperity of her neighbors—upon, that is, the neighbors being able to send her food and raw material in abundant quantities, upon their being able to carry on their industries. This is the crucial test of vital interdependence and it did not exist in any other country in the world at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

—Norman Angell, Arms and Industry, Extract from pp. 115, 116. (G. P. Putnam's Sons, Publishers.)

Although remnants of the old order of things still survive

the world has long since abandoned the archaic principle of self-sufficiency and to-day no family or district or nation endeavors to be self-contained. Indeed, the economic and political principles of society of former centuries have been completely revolutionized by the progress of invention which has made every individual, family, and nation dependent upon others for both the necessaries and luxuries of life. Interdependence has replaced self-sufficiency, and common interests among nations have taken the place of international antagonism. It is true that commercial jealousies exist, even now, between countries producing the same description of produce or manufacturing similar kinds of goods, but these jealousies arise from the largeness of the production of surplus supplies of food, raw materials, or manufactured articles for sale to other lands by individual countries, not from the smallness of their surpluses. In brief, the emulation to-day comes from the desire of each state to enjoy the largest commerce, and thus to be able to purchase the greatest quantity of produce or services from other lands for the consumption and use of its people.

—Sir George Paish, International Investments and Their Important Influence Upon International Unity, p. 58, in Documents of the American Association for International Conciliation, 1912.

I want you to recall the propositions with which I started, namely, that the relations of States are rapidly modifying in obedience to changing conditions—the greater division of labor set up by quicker communications; that this intensified division of labor sets up a condition of necessary interdependence between those who share the labor; that this condition of interdependence in its turn involves a necessary subsidence of the factor of physical force between them; that this sub-

sidence of physical force not only weakens necessarily the rôle of political control, but the very complexity of the division of labor tends to set up cooperation in groups which cut right athwart political frontiers, so that the political no longer limits or coincides with the economic frontier; and that, finally, partly as the cumulative effect of all these factors, and partly as the direct effect of devices born of the necessity of coordinating such factors, you get what I may term telegraphic financial reaction—a condition of sensibility by which the organism as a whole becomes quickly conscious of any damage to a part; that the matter may be summarized in the statement that military force is more and more failing in its effect, and must finally become—I think it has already become —economically futile.

—Norman Angell, Arms and Industry, Extract from pp. 130, 131. (G. P. Putnam's Sons, Publishers.)

Speaking of the impulse toward social coordination, Judge Baldwin has said:

"This impulse will be felt as a cosmic force in precise proportion to the psychological contact of nation with nation. Until the days of steam transportation there were few in any country, even among its leaders, who ever went far from their own land. The seventeenth century had indeed established the practice of maintaining permanent legations for diplomatic intercourse; but it was an intercourse limited to official circles. Modern facilities for travel, modern uses of electricity and the modern press have put the world, and even the embassy, on a different footing. There is no place left that is safe enough to hide state secrets. The telegraph and telephone have conquered time and space. The newspapers give daily to every one for two cents what a hundred years ago all the governments in the world could not have commanded in a year.

"Nations have been brought together by material forces, starting into action greater immaterial forces. Electricity is finishing what steam began. Men come close together who breathe a common intellectual atmosphere; who are fed daily by the same currents of thought; who hear simultaneously of the same events; who are eager to disclose to each other whatever new thing, coming to the knowledge of any, is worthy the notice of all."

The disposition, then, to take concerted international action grows with the opportunity in the means of communication. Each nation instantaneously feels the compulsion of the public opinion of all nations. Compare, for example, modern exchanges of views between governments, swiftly reaching a common basis of action and resulting increasingly in ends beneficent to the whole world, with former ignorance and mutual suspicion largely due to ignorance, resulting in no common action and permitting aggressions and abuses by single nations or small groups which to-day the concert of all nations protests against more and more loudly and less and less tolerates.

—Philander C. Knox, International Unity, pp. 11, 12, in Documents of the American Association for International Conciliation, 1910.

The United States is a noteworthy example of a country which is drifting away from agriculture as the predominant national industry and is steadily concentrating its energies in manufactures and foreign commerce, and thus the nation is constantly binding itself more intimately with other nations. In proportion as these solidarities are multiplied it becomes more difficult to break the ties existing among different countries, and consequently the proposition of war becomes more unpopular.

Commerce to-day rests on the broad and equitable principles

of reciprocity. In former times every nation was arrayed against every other nation, prepared to do it all the injury possible by prohibitions and restrictions on trade, and, if necessary, to go to war to accomplish its ruin. This policy has been abandoned, although vestiges of the old idea that one commercial nation may gain by ruining another still prevail. It was Gladstone who said that the ships that pass between one country and another are like the shuttle of the loom, weaving a web of concord among the nations. It is now widely recognized that the interest of any one nation accords with the common interest of all. This indeed was the keynote of the late President McKinley's farewell speech at Buffalo, wherein he reminded the American people that a system which provides a mutual exchange of commodities is manifestly essential to the continued and healthful growth of our export trade, and that we must not repose in fancied security that we can forever sell everything and buy little or nothing; but that if such a thing were possible, it would not be the best for us or for those with whom we deal. Hence he recommended the policy of reciprocity as one which would promote good will and friendly trade relations between the United States and foreign countries.

—JOHN BALL OSBORNE, Influence of Commerce in the Promotion of International Peace, pp. 6, 7, in the Documents of the American Association of International Conciliation, 1909.

Bankers are awaking, and in January, 1912, when Mr. Angell addressed the "Institute of Bankers" in London, there was so great a crowd that the doors had to be closed against those for whom there was no room. The gist of his teaching was profoundly ethical, though couched in the language of the Exchange. He showed his hearers that banking all unconsciously is bringing peace, by making nations financially

interdependent. This interdependence is largely the product of the last twenty years and reverses those conditions in which for ages, however wrong aggression might be, there was some material reward for it, by levying tribute, or by the conquest of neighboring colonies. Not even the peace advocates have been alive to this stupendous argument from the recent changes in world conditions, but have dwelt on the unchristian character of war, while often tacitly assuming with their opponents that, if a nation stole, it might gain somewhat material advantage in spite of wickedness. This is to-day the illusion that Norman Angell's facts and figures have made plain. That we, being many, are members one of another is the profound truth to which he has suddenly revealed a new and stunning application, one that of necessity could not have been so fully perceived before.

When the prosperity of an average German factory is distributed pretty evenly over some such factors as these; the capacity of a peasant in Provence who sells his olives in New York to subscribe to a South American loan, in order that a dock might be built on the Amazon to enable the manufacturer in Manchester to sell furniture in Baku to a merchant whose wealth is due to the development of petrol consumption in an automobile trade created in Paris—in a world where business is done under such conditions as these, we are told that the limits of commercial or industrial activity are determined by the limits of political influence, and that there exists some direct relation between political power and economic advantage! And we are still told it even when the prosperity of lesser states with no political power gives it daily the lie. The whole thing is one vast mystification, the most colossal illusion of the modern world.

—Lucia Ames Mead, Swords and Ploughshares,
Extracts from pp. 143-145.

## INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

The International Institute of Agriculture may be deemed a step in evolutionary development, development in the field of economics. It is substantially a world cooperative institution, a world clearing-house of economic information. It is, in fact, the first permanent international parliament, a permanent parliament for economic betterment.

The initiative toward founding this Institute was taken by His Majesty the King of Italy, who called a conference of the governments for this purpose. This conference met in Rome in 1905, and formulated a treaty for the establishment of the Institute. This treaty was ratified by forty-seven governments, and the adhering countries now embrace ninety-eight per cent of the population and ninety-five per cent of all the land of the world.

—David Lubin, The International Institute of Agriculture at Rome, in Papers on Inter-Racial Problems, Extract from pp. 254, 255.

The countries of the world have so much in common that there are now more than fifty official International Bureaux with permanent offices; there are nearly five hundred private international associations; and year by year not less than one hundred and fifty international congresses meet.

Numerous offices are constantly engaged on important matters that affect the civilized world, such as postal arrangements, telegraphs, commerce, trade-marks, patents, copyright, agriculture and the transmission of diseases, sanitary laws, weights and measures, maritime and river naigation, lighthouses, signaling, Suez Canal, transport, coinage, customs, crime and prisons, police, Red Cross and Geneva Convention, fisheries, and a great number more.

—T. P. Newman, The Approach of Nations, Extract from p. 4.

We talk of the flag, of liberty, of freedom, but in the one hundred cents of a dollar, is not each cent a measure of liberty, a measure of freedom? Has not its owner the liberty to exchange each cent for a certain measure of goods or for a certain measure of leisure? Hence it must follow that a cause which robs the cent of its purchasing power robs its owner of a like measure of liberty and freedom.

It was to prevent this universal, this international, robbery that the nations ratified the treaty establishing this Institute.

But a most important function of the Institute has yet to be stated: the International Institute of Agriculture is destined to become the world's temple of peace.

Professor Carver of Harvard University says:

I am particularly interested in the possibilities of the Institute as a factor in International Peace. If the leading nations can be brought together in any kind of cooperative work for the general good of the civilized world, such as your system of crop-reporting, the very fact of working together will tend to produce friendship, and to make war hereafter impossible. It is probable that International unity will never come about by merely saying "Go to now, let us be united," but it will come about by just this form of cooperative work for a useful purpose, without much immediate thought as to its future reactions in the field of international friendship.

The sages and prophets of our day find their task easier than of yore, for the time has at last come when it is beginning to be understood that robbery, covetous greed, or disorder is not nearly as profitable as Equity, Service, and Order. It is now beginning to be understood that the economic gloom of one country casts its dark shadow of loss and suffering on all other countries, and that the sun of prosperity which shines in one country sheds its beneficent rays abroad, blessing all the other countries.

And what mode is there for the surer and quicker realiza-

tion of International Equity, of International Service, and of International Order than through an International Parliament?

But Parliaments, and above all International Parliaments, do not come, nor would they endure, without a struggle. And this applies particularly to this first international economic parliament, the International Institute of Agriculture. The forces which find it in their interest to disintegrate its structure are among the most crafty and powerful in the world, and they have a reach which goes direct to the heart of governments.

Those, therefore, who champion the cause of international amity, should be among the first to take up an unmistakable stand in relation to this beginning of international administrative life.

—David Lubin, The International Institute of Agriculture at Rome, in Inter-Racial Problems, Extracts from pp. 257, 258.

It requires no argument to demonstrate the potent influence of satisfactory commercial relations in maintaining a secure and enduring peace between nations, for it is one of those self-evident truths which logic teaches and history confirms. The basic principle of this great silent influence is mutuality of interest. The same restraining forces are at work to avert a rupture of friendly relations between two countries engaged in commerce with each other as operate to prevent a quarrel between a business man and his customers or a lawyer and his clients.

Commerce is vitally dependent upon peace. So long as harmony prevails among the nations their commerce flourishes and develops normally from year to year; but upon the first rumors of war it begins to dwindle and to seek new channels where it will be least exposed to the many dangers of war. . . .

The best illustration in our times of the principle above enunciated that intimate commercial relations are an effective guaranty of peace is furnished by our trade relations with Great Britain. Notwithstanding the circumscribed area of the British Isles, no less than forty per cent of the total trade (imports and exports) between the United States and Europe is with the United Kingdom.

Here, in our trade relations with Great Britain, is strikingly exemplified the fact that the numerous ships which ply unceasingly between the two countries are engaged in the noble work of binding the nations together in international friendship and concord, and each and every vessel that comes and goes loaded to the full with the national products of one country destined for the people of the other is an effective agent in the cause of peace, tying, at each successive voyage, an additional knot in the bonds of mutual interest which unite the two nations.

—John Ball Osborne, American Association for International Conciliation.

The closer and more numerous the ties between nations which are created by commerce, the greater will be the reluctance on the part of any nation to begin a war; hence the greater the security against war. I have seen it suggested that these very ties created by commerce make war easier, for they afford just so many provocations for war. This is easy enough to allege and might seem plausible, especially to those whose minds are steeped in the history of the mercantile system, colonial conquests, and the struggle for commercial supremacy of long ago; but the experience of modern times has been quite otherwise. As a matter of fact, these commercial ties make the damages created by war so much in excess of any gains possible by war as to intensify the love of peace and the horror of war.

There are countless instances in history to illustrate the principle that commercial intimacy between two countries promotes and preserves peaceful relations between them. One of the most impressive is the case of England and Portugal, united in bonds of amity and mutality of trade interests for a century and a third by the famous Methuen Treaty of Reciprocity.

—JOHN BALL OSBORNE, American Association for International Conciliation.

One of the most persuasive books of recent years is entitled "The Great Illusion," and the illusion of which it treats is the idea that any people can possibly benefit itself by conquering, impoverishing or even annexing, forcibly, another people. The author shows that if it were possible for a German army to capture London there is nothing it could do to disturb the activities or prosperity of its inhabitants that would not react disastrously upon the people of Germany. It might be able to loot the Bank of England, but if the Bank of England was looted there would be a panic throughout the world, and nowhere greater than in Berlin. An illustration of this was afforded two years ago when a German warship steamed into a port of Morocco, with a remotely implied threat of war with France, with the result that so much French money was withdrawn from Germany that the Imperial Bank was obliged to expand its loans by $200,000,000 within thirty days, and meantime the Berlin stock exchange was in panic and German industries lost hundreds of millions more. No nation liveth to itself alone in the twentieth century. The wealth of the world is now a common fund. There is a reservoir in London, another in New York, another in Montreal, and others elsewhere, but they are all connected. You cannot draw down the supply of capital in one without affecting the supply in all.

You cannot burn up, confiscate, or destroy property anywhere that the whole civilized world does not suffer loss.

—GEORGE E. ROBERTS, The Common Interest.

Man's struggle is the struggle of the organism, which is human society, in its adaptation to its environment, the world —not the struggle between different parts of the same organism. . . . Britain to-day supports forty millions in greater comfort than it supported twenty a little over half a century ago. This has been accomplished, not by the various groups —Scots, English, Welsh, Irish—preying upon one another, but by exactly the reverse process: close cooperation between themselves and with populations outside.

That mankind as a whole represents the organism and the planet the environment, to which he is more and more adapting himself, is the only conclusion that consorts with the facts. If struggle between men is the true reading, those facts are absolutely inexplicable, for he is drifting away from conflict, from the use of physical force and toward cooperation. This much is unchallengeable, as the facts which follow will show.

But in that case, if struggle for extermination of rivals between men is the law of life, mankind is setting at naught the natural law, and must be on its way to extinction.

Happily the natural law in this matter has been misread. Man in his sociological aspect is not the complete organism. The man who attempts to live without association with his fellows, dies. Nor is the nation the complete organism. If Britain attempted to live without cooperation with other nations, half the population would starve. The completer the cooperation, the greater the vitality; the more imperfect the cooperation, the less the vitality. Now a body, the various parts of which are so interdependent that without coordination vitality is reduced or death ensues, must be regarded, in

so far as those functions are concerned, not as a collection of rival organisms, but as one. This is in accord with what we know of the character of living organisms in their conflict with environment. The higher the organism, the greater the elaboration and interdependence of its parts, the greater the need for coordination. . . .

Indeed, where the cooperation between the parts of the social organism is as complete as our mechanical development has recently made it, it is impossible to fix the limits of the community, and to say what is one community and what is another. Certainly the State limits no longer define the limits of the community; and yet it is only the State limits which international antagonism predicates. If the Louisiana cotton crop fails, a part of Lancashire starves. There is closer community of interest in a vital matter between Lancashire and Louisiana than between Lancashire and say, the Orkneys, part of the same State. There is much closer intercommunication between Britain and the United States in all that touches social and moral development than between Britain and, say, Bengal, part of the same State. An English nobleman has more community of thought and feeling with a European Continental aristocrat (will marry his daughter, for instance) than he would think of claiming with such "fellow" British countrymen as a Bengal babu, a Jamaica Negro, or even a Dorset yokel. A professor at Oxford will have closer community of feeling with a member of the French Academy than with, say, a Whitechapel publican. One may go further and say that a British subject of Quebec has closer contact with Paris than with London; the British subject of Dutch-speaking Africa with Holland than with England; the British subject of Hong Kong with Pekin than with London, and so on. In a thousand respects association cuts across State boundaries, which are purely conventional, and renders the biological division of man-

kind into independent and warring States a scientific ineptitude. . . .

No one thinks of respecting a Russian mujik because he belongs to a great nation, or despising a Scandinavian or Belgian gentleman because he belongs to a small one; and any society will accord prestige to the nobleman of Norway, Holland, Belgium, Spain, or even Portugal, where it refuses it to an English "bounder." The nobleman of any country will marry the noblewoman of another more readily than a woman from a lower class of his own country. The prestige of the foreign country rarely counts for anything in the matter when it comes to the real sentiment which now divides states. Just as in material things community of interest and relationship cut clear across State boundaries, so inevitably will the psychic community of interest come so to do.

—Norman Angell, The Great Illusion, Extracts from pp. 177-189. (G. P. Putnam's Sons, Publishers.)

Comprehension must be the soil in which shall grow all the fruits of friendship; and there is a reason and a compulsion lying behind all this which is dearer than anything else to the thoughtful men of America. I mean the development of constitutional liberty in the world. Human rights, national integrity, and opportunity as against material interests—that is the issue which we now have to face. I want to take this occasion to say that the United States will never again seek one additional foot of territory by conquest. She will devote herself to showing that she knows how to make honorable and fruitful use of the territory she has, and she must regard it as one of the duties of friendship to see that from no quarter are material interests made superior to human liberty and national opportunity. I say this, not with a single thought that any one will gainsay it, but merely to fix in our consciousness what our real relationship with

the rest of America is. It is the relationship of a family of mankind devoted to the development of true constitutional liberty. We know that that is the soil out of which the best enterprise springs. We know that this is a cause which we are making in common with our neighbors, because we have had to make it for ourselves.

—Woodrow Wilson, The United States and Latin America.

## COOPERATION A LAW OF LIFE

One idea that we can inculcate in all the schools, from the lowest to the highest, is that the "ferocious interpretation of nature," on which a false ethical code has been based, was due to a partial reading of nature, for which there is no longer any warrant or excuse. I was taught in childhood that the law of struggle was the highest law that creation knows; that every wayside pool was the scene of battle; that the ocean was the scene of a struggle, which might the "multitudinous seas incarnadine," and the law of life everywhere a battle in which no quarter was given. Of course there is truth in that, but now we are coming to see it is only one side of the process, only a phase of the law, and that deeper and more fundamental than any competition is the law of cooperation through all the orders of the world. Any species of birds that will not fly together as they fly South, shall all lose their way; any flock of sheep that cannot stand together in a winter's storm, all perish. Any utterly selfish species must die out as the world unfolds and develops; and deeper than any possible battle of group with group is the law that the group that will not stand together and stand with the other groups shall ultimately lose its chance in the unfolding, cosmic order. I believe we must teach that the laws of ethics are of universal, and not of local and provincial

application; that the law which binds man to man is in the last analysis identical with that which binds kingdom to kingdom, state to state, race to race. The law which prevails in a little province only is no law whatever. The law which prevails in a drop of water, and not in the solar system, is a law which is not understood; but when we do understand it, we find it absolutely without exception and universal. Chesterton, in one of those paradoxes which have set our generation thinking, has said: "When you break the great laws, you do not get freedom, you do not even get anarchy, you simply get the small laws." I believe that is profoundly true in international relations. When a nation breaks the great law of international concord, of human brotherhood, of racial amity, it simply comes under the dominion of the small laws of shot and shell, of increase of armor, of increased burden of taxation. Having appealed away from brotherhood unto Cæsar, unto Cæsar it shall go; having resolved to rely on the defense of Napoleon, to Napoleon it shall go, and with Napoleon it shall end. We have our choice between adhering to the great laws which antedate and surpass all individual and local needs, and simply appealing to the smaller laws which in turn will impose the heaviest possible burden.

—W. H. P. Faunce, How We May Educate for Peace, in Report of Lake Mohonk Conference, 1909, p. 139.

This nation has the one opportunity of all history to teach the world how men of all nationalities can work together, play together, live together, govern themselves together, cooperate together, and serve each other regardless of any racial or national distinctions. The world does not believe this. It will have to believe it if the United States is true to its divine calling and one great opportunity. Even now,

one who knows Europe well finds echoes of it everywhere. The author of these lines himself heard a distinguished German say: "How is it that in America Germans and English can dwell together as friends and brothers, while here we must be forever enemies?" And the United States is going to show Germany and England and the other nations that not only can these men dwell side by side as brothers, but she is going to answer this question: "How? Why?" It is simply that we are learning here that the things we all hold in common are infinitely more important than the things wherein we differ. They are more a part of our real selves, compose our being, make us *men,* while nationality, race, language, even color, are only clothes covering a soul which everywhere is one and the same. Love, happiness, health, kindliness of soul, are the same in every heart and nation, and are greater than the things that divide us. Here we emphasize these and find that we who once thought ourselves different are really one.

—Frederick Lynch, What Makes a Nation Great, pp. 28, 29.

**THE COMING DAY**

If four centuries ago, at the period when war was made by one district against the other, between cities, and between provinces—if, I say, some one had dared to predict to Lorraine, to Picardy, to Normandy, to Brittany, to Auvergne, to Provence, to Dauphiny, to Burgundy—"A day shall come when you will no longer make wars—a day shall come when you will no longer arm men one against the other—a day shall come when it will no longer be said that the Normans are attacking the Picards, or that the people of Lorraine are repulsing the Burgundians—you will still have many disputes to settle, interests to contend for, difficulties to resolve; but do you know what you will substitute instead of armed

men, instead of cavalry and infantry, of cannon, of falconets, lances, pikes, and swords—you will select, instead of all this destructive array, a small box of wood, which you will term a ballot-box, and from which shall issue—what?—an assembly—an assembly in which you shall all live—an assembly which shall be, as it were, the soul of all—a supreme and popular council, which shall decide, judge, resolve everything—which shall make the sword fall from every hand, and excite the love of justice in every heart—which shall say to each, 'Here terminates your right, there commences your duty: lay down your arms! Live in peace!' And in that day you will all have one common thought, common interests, a common destiny; you will embrace each other, and recognize each other as children of the same blood, and of the same race; that day you will no longer be hostile tribes—you will be a people; you will no longer be Burgundy, Normandy, Brittany, or Provence—you will be France! You will no longer make appeals to war—you will do so to civilization." If, at the period I speak of, some one had uttered these words, all men of a serious and positive character, all prudent and cautious men, all the great politicians of the period, would have cried out, "What a dreamer! what a fantastic dream! How little this pretended prophet is acquainted with the human heart! What ridiculous folly! what an absurd chimera!" Yet, gentlemen, time has gone on and on, and we find that this dream, this folly, this absurdity, has been realized. And I insist upon this, that the man who would have dared to utter so sublime a prophecy would have been pronounced a madman for having dared to pry into the designs of the Deity. Well, then, you at this moment say—and I say it with you—we who are assembled here say to France, to England, to Prussia, to Austria, to Spain, to Italy, to Russia—we say to them, "A day will come when from your hands also the arms you have grasped will fall,

A day will come when war will appear as absurd, and be as impossible, between Paris and London, between Saint Petersburg and Berlin, between Vienna and Turin, as it would be now between Rouen and Amiens, between Boston and Philadelphia. A day will come when you, France—you, Russia—you, Italy—you, England—you, Germany—all of you, nations of the Continent, will, without losing your distinctive qualities and your glorious individuality, be blended into a superior unity, and constitute a European fraternity, just as Normandy, Brittany, Burgundy, have been blended into France. A day will come when the only battlefield will be the market open to commerce and the mind opening to new ideas. A day will come when bullets and bombshells will be replaced by votes, by the universal suffrage of nations, by the venerable arbitration of a great Sovereign Senate. But, French, English, Germans, Russians, Slavs, Europeans, Americans, what have we to do in order to hasten the advent of that great day? We must love each other! To love each other is, in this immense labor of pacification, the best manner of aiding God!

—Victor Hugo, The United States of Europe, pp. 4, 5.

## CHAPTER VIII

## THE PRESENT NEED OF INTERRACIAL APPRECIATION AND GOOD WILL

The narrow-minded ask, Is this one of our tribe, or is he a stranger? But to those who are of a noble disposition, the whole world is but one family. —ANCIENT HINDU.

### THE FATHERLAND

Where is the true man's fatherland?
  Is it where he by chance is born?
  Doth not the yearning spirit scorn
In such scant borders to be spanned?
Oh yes! his fatherland must be
As the blue heaven wide and free!

Is it alone where freedom is,
  Where God is God and man is man?
  Doth he not claim a broader span
For the soul's love of home than this?
Oh yes! his fatherland must be
As the blue heaven wide and free!

Where'er a human heart doth wear
  Joy's myrtle-wreath or sorrow's gyves,
  Where'er a human spirit strives
After a life more true and fair,
There is the true man's birthplace grand,
His is a world-wide fatherland!

Where'er a single slave doth pine,
  Where'er one man may help another—
  Thank God for such a birthright, brother—
That spot of earth is thine and mine!
There is the true man's birthplace grand,
His is a world-wide fatherland!

—LOWELL.

## BETTER RACIAL UNDERSTANDING

Among nations as among individuals, good understanding is the basis of good feeling. The fact that here, throughout the length and breadth of the land, our citizens of so many different origins live together on terms of amity and good will, is itself an illustration of what may yet be hoped for among the countries of their diverse origin, as good understanding takes the place of misunderstanding and good neighborhood takes the place of purely formal relationship.

As a result of the facilities for travel which are characteristic of our day, the nations of the modern world are being brought into contact with each other as never before. President Wheeler, of the University of California, in a speech made at the dinner of the American Asiatic Association, pointed out that all of the world lying west of the Hydaspes River, the point which marked the furthest reach of the conquests of Alexander the Great, had developed more or less directly under the influence of the civilization of the Mediterranean, while all of the world lying beyond the Hydaspes—India, China, and Japan—had developed, until recently, untouched by that civilization; so that to-day the East and West are looking into each other's eyes after a development that has been different for century after century; with a different social order, with a different code of morals, with a different literature, with a different religious faith: in a word, with everything different that tends to make individuality in a nation. What will come out of the close contact forced upon both East and West by the developments of modern life it is impossible to foresee; but this at least is clear, that, if a good understanding is permanently to prevail, it must begin with a recognition of this fundamental difference in training. Such a recognition must take every serious difference in point of view for granted, and both East and West must try to discover, behind these differences in point

of view, what is fine and admirable in each other's civilization. Approached in that spirit, it is reasonable to believe that the close contact necessitated between East and West, in our modern times, may prove to be for the advantage of both. If approached in any other spirit, no one can imagine the disastrous consequences that may follow.

—Seth Low, The East and the West, American Association for International Conciliation, 1910, Extracts from pp. 6, 7.

"A man must learn a great deal," says Marcus Aurelius, "to enable him to pass a correct judgment on another man's acts." And among the things which he must first learn is this—that the men of every age have their own standard of excellence and that they can be judged fairly only by their own code of morals. It is largely because of the general ignorance of the history of moral ideals that there is so much uncharitableness in the world, so much intolerance, so much race prejudice and hatred. As one's intellectual outlook broadens, as he becomes acquainted with the various types of goodness of different peoples and different ages, he becomes more liberal and charitable in his moral judgments, since he comes to understand that moral character is determined not by the ideal of conduct but by the way in which this ideal is lived up to. "There may be as genuine self-devotion," declares the moralist Professor Green, "in the act of the barbarian warrior who gives his life that his tribe may win a piece of land from its neighbors, as in that of the missionary who dies in carrying the gospel to the heathen."

Studying the ideals of races and epochs in the spirit of these words, we shall make some fruitful discoveries. We shall learn for one thing that since the beginning of the truly ethical age there has ever been about the same degree of conscientiousness in the world; that the different ages, viewed

in respect to their moral life, have differed chiefly in the degree of light they have enjoyed, and consequently in their conception of what is noblest in conduct, of what constitutes duty, not in their fealty or lack of fealty to their chosen standard of excellence. That is to say, speaking broadly, the majority of men in every age and in every land have ever followed loyally the right as they have been given to see the right. "If men and times were really understood," the historian Von Holst truly observes, "the moral fault of their follies and crimes will almost always appear diminished by one half."—From pp. 10, 11, History as Past Ethics, by PHILIP VAN NESS MYERS; by permission of Ginn and Company, Publishers.

If America is to meet, in any adequate fashion, the challenge of the modern age, it is obvious that it must not only come to terms with its inherited Puritan ideal, with all that that implies, but must also specifically face its great peculiar problems of relation to the Negro race. There has been forced upon us, again and again in the course of our discussion, the primary and essential significance of reverence for personality as a guiding principle in human development. We cannot pretend, therefore, even superficially, to have faced the challenge of the times, if we refuse to note with care the bearing of this principle upon the Negro problem. . . .

We need the clarifying and steadying power of great principles nowhere more than here, where prejudice and passion are so easily aroused. Surely we want to know the truth, the path of real justice, and to follow it. The history of the race should make clear that no question can be settled until it is settled right. And we can be perfectly certain that we cannot here lightly turn our backs on that principle, which we have seen to be an absolutely basic moral and Christian principle, a principle whose dominion is demanded

by modern conditions at multiplied points, and a principle that has proved itself the supreme test of civilization in human history. Only one principle can guide us in the difficulties of the relations of race to race—reverence for the person as such, absolutely unaffected by color or race connection. . . .

Whites and blacks may be reminded, also, that, as a great philosopher has pointed out, the qualities that have made the Anglo-Saxon so often dominant are not altogether enviable qualities; they have their distinctly ungenerous, hard, selfish, domineering side, that any race may well avoid. The so-called "John Bull attitude" the Negro need not envy. As contrasted with this, the pure Negro seems often to have a temperamental kindliness of disposition, a good-nature, a readiness to make the most of a situation, and to find none insufferable, that, while it may often be an obstacle to advancement, has a great gift to make to the contentment and happiness of life. It is possible to make life quite too strenuous, to live so completely in the future as never really to live in the present—to take no enjoyment in life as it passes. And this is the certain danger of the American rush. The Negro's tendency to content—while undoubtedly a temptation to laziness—has in it, thus, a real element of strength, and much suggestion for an over-enterprising people that has become frantic in its haste.

All these characteristics of the Negro are connected with his unusual emotional endowment. And the whites may well be on their guard against that "certain blindness in human beings" which should keep them from at least some imaginative appreciation of the power of insight, revelation, and enjoyment involved in such emotional capacities. Dangers, this immense emotional endowment surely has; but let one measure its worth by remembering that the sense of reality itself roots in feeding, and by recalling the difference between

the hours in which life seems cold and dead, and those in which, in warmth of feeling, his being tingles with the sense of life's meaning.

And we may not forget—what Stanley Hall and Booker T. Washington have both recalled—the positive genius which the Negro seems to have for religion. His natural religious endowment is probably unsurpassed by that of any race, unless it be the Jewish. And the modern Jew is hardly his rival here. That his religious feeling needs much intelligent direction is undoubted, but quite unwonted religious capacity he certainly has. He is a natural seer; and the more utilitarian the triumphs of the race, the less can it spare the Negro, with his undying sense of another world and another life and of the presence of God in the world. . . .

Undoubtedly, with the many differences between individuals and races, the feeling of uncongeniality must often be present, sometimes in such marked degree that some kinds of association, at least, are better not attempted. But even then the feeling is not one to be proud of; and one needs to recognize a certain limitation and blindness in himself that prevents him from entering with sympathetic understanding into the life and thought of the other man or race, and finding some larger basis of agreement. While, then, we recognize race antipathy as a fact, with a measure of justification, we may not defend it as a final good, but we are rather to see it, in the light of present-day world conditions already pointed out, as one of the greatest present obstacles to the progress of the human race. . . .

No feeling of uncongeniality can justify essential injustice, and the white cannot keep his own self-respect, however brilliantly he may argue, if he refuses complete justice to the Negro, or refuses obedience to the finer fundamental moral and Christian principle of reverence for the person. . . . To preserve his own self-respect, therefore, the white man must

be scrupulously just, never denying the Negro his fair and equal chance—his *chance for all the development of which he is capable.* Any other policy is suicidal for the nation. We are a professed democracy. Now it is impossible to look at the question of democracy in the large and not see that any attempt to hold the Negro down is a blow to the nation's life. . . .

The present situation as to race prejudice and race antipathy of all kinds is a divine challenge to us all of every race, and a solemn call to the rededication of ourselves to the finer fruits of the moral and Christian spirit—to the spirit of reverence for the person. Like Christ, we are to stand and knock at the door of the humblest personality. Like Christ, we stoop in shame wherever the inner sanctities of any soul are violated.

—Henry Churchill King, The Moral and Religious Challenge of Our Times, Extracts from pp. 283-308. (The Macmillan Co., Publishers.)

The problem of the South is not that of two races inhabiting the same region, nor of a people of different habits, the one thinly scattered among the other. It is the problem of a mixed race, its parentage on the one hand and sometimes on both regarded as inferior—suddenly raised from slavery to freedom as a result of war. Even in the South the responsibility for race friction rests largely with ourselves.

It was an avowed purpose of our Civil War "to settle once for all that men were men"—that is, a man should count for what he is worth irrespective of race or ancestry. We should, as Lincoln once observed, not say that he belongs to a lower race and hence must have a lowlier seat.

Too many of us—and especially since the war in the Philippines—have forgotten this principle, and the most hopeless

feature of the matter is that our Negroes have themselves failed to grasp its meaning, for as a whole they are not thrifty, frugal, industrious, or ambitious. Their great leader, Booker T. Washington, has recognized that the Negro problem must be solved by the individual Negroes largely each one for himself.

The Japanese have no such problem. Their points of difference from their brother Aryans of the West lie largely in their early training, and in their customs developed in centuries of isolation. They have never been servile; they are quite competent to solve their own problems individually or collectively; they will never give us cause to question whether indeed "men are men"; they have their limitations, all sorts of people may be found among them. Some are wise, helpful, honest, devoted in the highest degree, and with the addition of a fine touch of artistic taste; some are as selfish, mean, and untrustworthy as the worst anti-Japanese slanderer has ever imagined. Our own race shows all these contradictions. . . . Under the training of our schools and of our business conditions, no race of people is more readily assimilated, if by assimilation we mean sympathy and understanding of our institutions. This is a matter quite separate from physical resemblance and from mixture of races. And while no one would welcome race mixture on any large scale, it contains no special element of evil. From the best of each race superior men and women are born. When races mix at the bottom the progeny is like its parentage. Among educated Japanese there are many mixed families, the children to all appearance worthy of father and mother.

—David Starr Jordan, War and Waste, Extracts from pp. 269-271.

When we are confronted by the Italian lazzaroni, the peasants from the Carpathian foothills, and the proscribed

traders from Galatia, we have no national ideality founded upon realism and tested by our growing experience with which to meet them, but only the platitudes of our crudest youth. The philosophers and statesmen of the eighteenth century believed that the universal franchise would cure all ills; that liberty and equality rested only upon constitutional rights and privileges; that to obtain these two and to throw off all governmental oppression constituted the full duty of the progressive patriot. We will keep to this formalization because the philosophers of this generation give us nothing newer. We ignore the fact that world-wide problems can no longer be solved by a political constitution assuring us against opposition, but that we must frankly face the proposition that the whole situation is more industrial than political.

—Jane Addams, Newer Ideals of Peace, Extract from pp. 41, 42. (The Macmillan Company, Publishers.)

Great though the achievements of arbitration have already been, great though its future is likely to be, one must not be blind to its limitations. It is an instrument for settling disputes between governments; in particular, disputes likely to give rise to difficulties between States which diplomacy fails to settle. No doubt some of these questions are at bottom racial; such, for example, are the recurring difficulties as to emigration between China and Japan on the one hand and Great Britain and her colonies and the United States on the other hand. These difficulties take an economic form; they originate in racial antagonism and prejudice. And even when no racial element is obviously and indisputably present, the real though latent difficulty in the way of a settlement of disputes may be the repugnance or distrust arising from race prejudice and misunderstanding.

International arbitration does not touch, nor is it proposed that it should touch, many internal and domestic questions

profoundly interesting to races which are not dominant. I take almost at random racial questions which happen to be of late uppermost: the condition of the Jews in Russia and Poland; the Poles under Russian rule; the Rumanians in Hungary; the Finns in Russia; the Macedonians and Armenians in Turkey; the East Indians in South Africa; the natives of the Congo State under Belgian rule. International arbitration does not help to solve except very remotely and indirectly the problems which these names recall. To-day each State says, and will long continue to say, "I must be master in my own house." That position must be accepted—at all events for the time. We must look elsewhere for a solution (so far as possible) of some of the great problems due to differences and collisions of races.

But it may be of interest to endeavor to examine whether the ends which the originators of the Congress had in view cannot be furthered by other means than arbitration; and, in particular, by a clearer recognition of duties to subject races than now exists; by better organization of existing agencies, and by the creation of new organizations. I am sensible of the difficulty of making useful suggestions as to questions, so many, so varied in character, and, it may be said, with so little in common. . . . Great are the limitations of all machinery and organizations in accomplishing the chief aims in view. The walls of racial prejudice will not yield to mere organization; the spread of knowledge, the spirit of charity, and new ideals are the only solvents. . . .

I pass over as not meriting notice in this Congress the contention which is rarely nowadays made in so many words, that a high degree of civilization carries with it a right to impose the will of the superior upon the inferior; that as between them might is right and that the former may do exactly as they think fit in virtue of their superiority.

Turning to statements less uncompromising, I proceed to

cite those of one or two writers. The first is by Mr. John Stuart Mill:

"There is a great difference (for example) between the case in which the nations concerned are of the same, or something like the same, degree of civilization, and that in which one of the parties to the situation is of a high, and the other of a very low grade of social improvement. To suppose that the same international customs, and the same rules of international morality, can obtain between one civilized nation and another and between civilized nations and barbarians, is a grave error and one which no statesman can fall into, however it may be with those who, from a safe and unresponsible position, criticize statesmen. Among many reasons why the same rules cannot be applicable to situations so different, the two following are among the most important. In the first place the rules of ordinary international morality imply reciprocity. But barbarians will not reciprocate. They cannot be depended upon for observing any rules. Their minds are not capable of so great an effort, nor their wills sufficiently under the influence of distant motives. In the next place nations which are still barbarous have not gone beyond the period during which it is likely to be for their benefit that they should be conquered and held in subjection by foreigners. Independence and nationality so essential to the due growth and development of a people further advanced in improvement, are generally impediments to them. . . . A violation of great principles of morality it may easily be; and barbarians have no rights as a nation, except a right to such treatment as may, at the earliest possible period, fit them for becoming one. The only moral laws for the relation between a civilized and a barbarous government are the universal rules of morality between man and man." . . .

It is to be noted that there is not a clear line of separation between civilized and barbarous nations; they often differ

from each other by small degrees; the sharp distinction drawn in the passage which I have quoted from Mill between civilized nations and barbarous, does not help one in solving the actual problems, which for the most part relate to the dealings of nations with different types of civilizations, the relative value of which in the eyes of impartial observers, if such existed, might be dubious. What is the test of superiority? There is often suggested the test of proficiency in war, according to which the Turks some centuries ago were probably supreme among all nations, the Italians, contemporaries of Michael Angelo and Leonardo da Vinci, not excepted. There is a test of wealth; a test the justice of which, if applied to individuals, would be denied. There is the test of morality, the existence of a legal moral code and conformity of conduct thereto, and a test the application of which, if possible, might lead to startling results. Nor is the distinction between the progressive and non-progressive races so clear to modern ethnologists as it was to those who knew little. The so-called stationary races are often merely those whose changes are unrecorded. As Professor Royce justly remarks, this test has never been so fairly applied by civilized nations as to give exact results. . . . What is clear is that the world would be the poorer if one type of civilization were to be universal; what we cannot be sure of is, that an unpromising race, if left to itself, may not be the starting-point of a development which will enrich mankind.

—Sir John Macdonell, Papers in Inter-Racial Problems, Extracts from pp. 398-401.

## APPRECIATION OF THE JAPANESE AND CHINESE

It is particularly desirable, in order to avoid ill will and possible strife, that Japan should be understood by the Western peoples. And among them all, what one can be more

interested in, and obligated to, the careful cultivation of such good understanding that leads to good will than is the United States?

The impression which has been fostered by such writers as Mr. Kipling, and even by Mr. Hearn, as well as by many travelers and chance visitors, that Orient and Occident are so radically different as to make it impossible for them to understand each other, has gone abroad widely. The impression is by no means wholly true. Even the aversions, oppositions, and antagonisms awakened by the British in India, the Dutch in Java and Sumatra, the Russians in China, and the Americans in the Philippines, are in each case substantially the same as those which the other party would feel, if the relations were reversed. That it is inconceivable for relations ever to be reversed, may turn out on reflection, or even at some time in the future on experience, to be a mere product of racial self-conceit. It is not yet proved that the Anglo-Saxons or any other European peoples are designed by a retributive Providence to become that "recurrent curse of mankind, a dominant race."

At all events, a great deal of that which can be said, with much impressiveness and with no little truth-seeming, of other nations of the Far East, cannot be said of Japan. For Japan has never been, and is not now, *Oriental,* as are India, China, and Korea. Its two hundred and fifty years of exclusiveness and of isolated feudal development, as well as certain racial characteristics, prevented the more purely *Oriental* type of civilization from gaining supremacy there. Indeed, up to the time when the warships of the United States under Commodore Perry appeared off her coasts, the political and social constitution and habits of life of Japan, in several important respects resembled more those of mediaeval Europe than those of the other eastern nations of that date. This contention could be established, if it were necessary, by a

detailed examination of the different main factors entering into its civilization. But the fact forms one of the most important reasons why Japan has so rapidly and readily adopted and adapted the business methods and modes of procedure, the system of public and professional education, the instruments and technique of manufacture, and even the constitutional policy and legal forms of Europe and America. Thus, the citizen of the United States or of Western Europe, who is prepared to get below certain superficial differences and reach down to the more fundamental likeness, may feel more at home in Japan than in certain parts of Europe itself; and much more than in Turkey in Asia or, indeed, any portion of the Near East. Even those more subtle differences in religious, ethical, and political conceptions which still undoubtedly influence, or even practically dominate, the Japanese mind, are, in most cases, not difficult for the psychologist or the student of history to recognize in himself or in his ancestors.

I am glad then to testify out of a full and long experience, that just as intelligent, self-respecting, and mutually respecting, and permanent friendships may exist between individual Japanese and individual Americans as between any two classes of individuals within either of the two nations. But much more than this is true, or, rather, the same thing is true as between the two nations at large. On the whole, and until the most recent times, the feeling of the Japanese people toward the United States has been one of warm friendship, and even of admiration and enthusiastic good will. This feeling on their part has contained, indeed, a considerable mixture of gratitude and other elements that are not likely to endure; but in union with these there has always been something more permanently and deeply interfused. This has been an apprehension—at first rather dim but becoming clearer as the future relations of the two nations

have defined themselves in thought and in fact—of a certain community of intellectual, social, and commercial interests between them, the welfare of which requires peace, and the marring, if not the total destruction, of which would come about through alienation and war.

—George Trumbull Ladd, America and Japan, American Association for International Conciliation, 1908, Extracts from pp. 5-8.

In the province of Manchuria there is a great cemetery which the Japanese have consecrated to the burial of the Russians who died in the battles in that vicinity. When the Russian army retreated, they left thousands unburied: the Japanese army collected every bone and every bit of uniform and every broken weapon that they found upon the field of battle and buried all with military honors. The graves of the soldiers have been marked with iron crosses in the Greek form, and those of the officers with similar crosses of white marble. When the cemetery was dedicated, Russian ecclesiastics and military commanders were invited to share in the ceremonies. It has been well pointed out that it was fifty years after the battle of Gettysburg before we invited our brothers in the South to meet us where they fought with the men of the North, there to thank God together for a united country. What took fifty years for us to do, the Japanese have done in five years. A nation that can forgive as Japan has forgiven and show it in this beautiful act has certainly caught the spirit of Christ and taught us a lesson to which we may well give heed. Well may we call the men of such a nation our brothers, and so live as to come into a closer bond with them among the nations of the earth.

—Samuel B. Capen, Foreign Missions and World Peace.

"God's in the Occident;
God's in the Orient."

Are the representatives of one civilization justified in attempting to modify another and radically different one? Even if the modifying civilization be superior to that which is modified, is the result of the process certain to be good? Destruction is easier than construction. The bad seems to be easier of propagation than the good. Granted that the civilization of Europe and America is superior to that of China, may not the contact of Western nations with China do China more harm than good? . . .

There are now perhaps a million Roman Catholics and two hundred and fifty thousand Protestants among the Chinese. The missionaries, of whose labors these converts are the product, are from England, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Australia, Canada, and the United States. They number some 1,200 Roman Catholics and 3,500 Protestants, and represent some seventy different societies and nearly a score of different denominations.

The existence of this Christian community, small fraction though it is of the total population, is an undoubted and great benefit to China, as are also the hospitals, printing-presses, and schools that have come in with the Christian missionaries. But it is much to be regretted that the Chinese Christians are organized into churches separated from one another not only by denominational lines, but also by the national and sectional lines that separate the missionary organizations. Thus, there are not only Presbyterians, Methodists and Baptists, but several classes of each according to the country or even the section of country from which the missionaries came. Christian missionaries have not yet learned how to impart to a non-Christian people the essential elements of their religion in their purity and simplicity, but with these have

always carried along those sectarian peculiarities which are the unhappy record of the controversies of the past. . . .

The Chinese are a very able people, physically sturdy and intellectually keen. The process of natural selection has in large measure destroyed the weaklings and left a people of remarkable physical toughness and endurance. Their education, narrow though it has been, has by no means destroyed their intellectual powers. The scholars educated in the old learning are men of intellectual power within their range, and Chinese youth easily hold their own with those of Europe and America, heirs of the centuries of Western civilization.

The Chinese are a people of relatively high morality. The majority of the people are at the same time Buddhists, Taoists, and Confucianists. Buddhism and Taoism, as they exist to-day, are largely permeated with superstition, and have little, if any, power for good. But Confucianism, of which alone the men of the scholar class confess themselves adherents, presents a high moral standard, and exerts to-day, as it has for centuries, a powerful and, on the whole, a healthful moral influence. Political life is unfortunately permeated and seriously corrupted by what we call "graft"—what the Chinese call "squeeze." . . .

But the standard of commercial life is remarkably high. The reputation of Chinese merchants in the East is that they will keep a contract if it ruins them. It is customary to settle all accounts at the end of the Chinese year, and, in times past, it has been a common custom, as it is still to some extent, that the debtor who could not pay his debts at the beginning of the new year committed suicide.

The Chinese people are a peaceable people. They do not love war, and will fight only if it is inevitable. Until very lately the soldier has been at the bottom of the social ladder.

Only Western influence and the danger of foreign encroachment have begun of late to change this. In this respect China

is in sharp contrast with Japan, in which from time immemorial the soldier class has been the aristocracy. The peaceableness of the Chinese appears also in their tolerance. Their history is not one of religious wars. Their persecutions of Christians have been largely anti-foreign rather than anti-Christian. The Boxers, though they murdered Christian missionaries and their converts, and destroyed all mission property within reach, were moved rather by patriotism that saw no way to check foreign aggression except to exterminate the foreigner and foreign influence, rather than by a religious hatred. . . .

Chinese civilization is in some respects in advance of that of Europe and America. If we have something to impart, we have also much to learn, and their assimilation of our civilization entire would be by no means an unmixed good. It is a fair question, which as Occidentals and as Christians we ought to consider, whether it would not be for China's advantage for us all to withdraw and leave her to work out her own problems and develop her own civilization. To answer this question demands the consideration of several facts.

China is just entering upon a new period in her history. For good or evil, willingly or unwillingly, she has determined to abandon the policy of centuries, and instead of maintaining herself in isolation, to become one of the nations of the world. So radical are the changes, political, military, educational, social, moral, which this momentous step involves or may involve, that it practically amounts to the creation of a new civilization. There are great possibilities of both good and evil in it. . . . To enable the people of China to meet this situation, and make the present moment the beginning not only of a new, but of a better, period in her history, the West has much that it might give.

China needs our Western science. She is aware that she needs it to develop her material resources, to open her mines

and build her railroads. But, in fact, she needs it even more to change the mental attitude of centuries, and train her young men to ask as the fundamental question, not as heretofore, "What are the teachings of the sages of the past?" but "What are the facts; what is the truth?" China needs a knowledge of the history of the great civilization of the world to guide her in the great task of creating a new Chinese civilization that shall not only be better than the old civilization of China, but better, perhaps, than any that Western nations have yet produced. China needs all that we know about education and the art of educating. In her discarded system of education the teacher held a place of high honor, but he was not a teacher in our sense of the word. The new education demands a new type of teaching. China needs all that we have learned in the field of the social sciences, from national finance to family life and eugenics.

China needs also the best we have to give in morals and religion. Confucianism sets on the whole a high moral standard, and the Christian missionaries have learned to regard it not as an evil to be uprooted, but a foundation to build on. But Christianity has something to give that Confucianism has not given and that China lacks. Family life in China, even among the upper classes, falls far below the best type of home that Christianity produces. . . .

The distinctly religious element of Christianity also, its conception of a personal God who is a reality in the life of men, and is worthy to be trusted and loved as the Heavenly Father—this and the inspiration and empowerment of noble living that it affords, Confucianism fails to furnish. If we offer them the best we have in our science, history and economics, we cannot forbear to offer them also the best we have in morals and religion.

The evils of Western civilization have already found their way into the East. The pagan elements that linger still in

our Western, nominally Christian, civilization, we have forced upon them. Our military spirit, our rudeness of manner, our contemptuous disregard of the rights and feelings of others who are less aggressive, our habits of intemperance—by these the Western nations are already well known in the East, and there is no prospect that we can at once abate their evil influence. The open question is whether we shall, with our worst, give our best, by the gift of our best atone for the evil we have done in sending our worst, and at length displace the evil with the good. . . .

Shall we on the one hand, following what has been too often the practice of Western nations in relation to the East, look upon this as an opportune moment to exploit China for our own benefit? Or shall we, in accordance with the policy that the better sentiment of the nation has approved in respect to Cuba and the Philippines, and the precedent set by our return to China of the excess of the Boxer indemnity above a just amount, regard this as an opportunity of applying to China the Golden Rule, which we approve and to some extent practice in relations between man and man? The practical answer that we give to this question will go far to indicate to what extent we have become a Christian nation, to what extent we are still pagans and barbarians. If to continue to influence China means only to export to her the vices of Western civilization, then, for China's sake and our own, the sooner we withdraw the better. But if to the elements of her strength we can add those elements of our religion and civilization by virtue of which we may claim to be at least a semi-civilized and semi-Christian nation, then, to do this will be immensely for China's advantage and for ours.

—Ernest D. Burton, International Conciliation in the Far East, American Association for International Conciliation, 1910, Extracts from pp. 18-23.

Some time in the long future our country may be wise enough to frame immigration acts which shall treat all nations of the world alike. This problem, most difficult at the best, cannot be settled offhand nor can it be settled now. Perhaps some time we may see our way to admit skilled laborers only, from any region, and only when accompanied by their families. But no final adjustment is possible now; and all the Japanese ask for is to be spared the humiliation involved in any scheme for the exclusion of Asiatics as Asiatics. This is a matter of national sensitiveness to a highly cultivated and sensitive people; and needlessly to hurt such a nation is to hurt ourselves. For the lines of commerce run in grooves of international friendliness. An indirect exclusion act, as of races not eligible for citizenship, is more humiliating than a direct act would be. It implies that the Japanese cannot read between the lines. Exclusion from citizenship, for which discrimination, if indeed it really exists, no adequate cause exists, is of the nature of insult in itself. To be shut out because they have been insulted once adds doubly to a humiliation they have no power to resent, but which they hope their nearest friend among the nations will not offer them.

—David Starr Jordan, War and Waste, Extract from pp. 262, 263.

China is at present most friendly to America. But how long will she remain so? When her people become as well versed in the affairs of the world as Japan and India are to-day; when she becomes conscious of the solidarity of white antipathy to Asiatics and to a treatment of Chinese contrary to our treaties and out of harmony with her dignity; when she learns of California anti-alien legislation and the refusal of America as a whole to let any Asiatics become citizens

of this land, whatsoever their personal qualification, is it likely that China will maintain her friendship unbroken?

Against a solid anti-Asiatic white race, will there not inevitably arise a solid anti-white Asia? And will this not mean vast economic disaster to both East and West through military and naval expenses and interrupted or undeveloped commerce?

But the evils of protracted yellow and white perils are even more profound.

The two great streams of civilization, Occidental and Oriental, the product of millenniums of divergent evolution, are in a large sense complementary. We Westerners easily see that we have much of value to give to the East. We do not so easily see that they have something of worth to give to us. Yet such, nevertheless, is the fact. But this mutual interchange of our best spiritual treasures cannot go forward on a basis of mutual suspicion, hatred, and enmity. Only as friendship is established and maintained can we give them our best. This, moreover, is essential if we are to lift them to the level of our own life. It is no doubt true that, unless we elevate them to our own level, ultimately they will pull us down to theirs. Only on the basis of friendship too can we receive from them the best they have to give, thus enriching our own lives.

Such in barest outlines is the situation. A new era in human evolution has begun. The races and civilizations are face to face. This new era should be one of glorious interchange—an era of universal convergent evolution; but obstacles of race pride, aggression, ambition, suspicion lie athwart our path. Perils, yellow and white, threaten the best interests of us all—East and West.

Many see no solution to the race problem save that of mutual exclusion. For the admission of Asiatics to America, as we admit immigrants from Europe, means, they assert, an

Asiatic inundation. To such thinkers, complete surrender or complete segregation are the only alternative courses.

Just here, however, lies the great mistake, for there is a third course. In briefest outline, it is a policy that provides for the gradual admission of Asiatics with provision for their education, assimilation, and naturalization. By the early adoption of this policy, America can avoid both Scylla and Charybdis, devitalize both the yellow and white perils, and secure the inestimable advantages of the mutual exchange by East and West of their best. But at once someone will proclaim that Asiatics, and especially Japanese, are not assimilable. Though we admit them to our land, they will never become parts of our civilization nor really enter into our life. They are Oriental and we Occidental. Can oil and water mix? No more can East and West; and Kipling will be quoted:

> **"Oh, East is East and West is West,**
> **And never the twain shall meet**
> **Till earth and sky stand presently**
> **At God's great judgment seat."**

They, however, who quote these now famous lines, forget or never heard the lines that immediately follow:

> **"But there is neither East nor West,**
> **Border nor breed nor birth,**
> **When two strong men stand face to face,**
> **Tho' they come from the ends of the earth."**

There are indeed real differences between the East and the West, yet there is also real and still deeper unity.

I now sum up the various items in the proposed new American Oriental policy:

1. American citizenship should be granted to every qualified individual regardless of race.

2. Immigration from any land should be allowed on a

percentage rate of those from that land already naturalized with their American-born children.

3. There should be a Bureau of Alien Registration and Education.

4. The granting of naturalization should be vested in a Bureau of Naturalization.

5. There should be direct Federal responsibility for all legal and legislative matters in which aliens as such are involved.

6. A National Commission should be appointed to study and report on the problems of Biological and Sociological Assimilation.

7. Children and young people in public schools should be educated in Oriental history.

Such are the outlines of a comprehensive policy for the treatment of all races and nations and the care of all resident aliens in our lands. To some it may perhaps seem a misnomer to call this plan a new Oriental policy, for it advocates nothing distinctive regarding Orientals. True! And this exactly is the reason for calling it our New Oriental Policy. It is a policy which does not discriminate again Asiatics, and therefore, it is new. It is new both as to its spirit and as to its concrete elements.

—Sidney L. Gulick, The Japanese Problem.

I hesitate to give expression to the profound feeling with which I contemplate this possibility of the two nations co-operating in generous brotherliness toward Asia. I have found Japan so full of noble sentiments, so eager for the best things in our Western world, while yet so loyal to the best heritage of her past, that I have not only admiration for her scholars and statesmen, but the highest hopes for her national expansion. I believe she has in a large measure the future of Asia in her keeping. No such opportunity has come to any

Asiatic nation, perhaps to no nation of the world, to show that a magnanimous policy is the wise policy. I feel it a test of Japan's true greatness. Will she only repeat the lessons taught by European policies in Asia, insisting only upon her rights; or will she give the world a new and epoch-making lesson in sacrificial internationalism, in which, while protecting her own future, she shall, with the hearty cooperation of America, also safeguard the rights of a huge, unshaped people bravely trying to tread the same path she herself has trod?

—Shailer Mathews, America and the Asiatic World, p. 24.

**RESPECT FOR OTHER RACES**

In the many narratives of modern exploration, conquerors and pioneers of civilization, I can recall few cases in which the conscience of a modern explorer or promoter smites him, and he is filled with doubts whether it was right to break up tribal organizations and convert into masses of shifting atoms what were once strong cohesive organizations, the rudiments of nations, if not nations full grown. Even when no cruelties have been practiced toward native races, when on the contrary there has been a desire to deal fairly with them, the results have often been disastrous. The old tribal system is broken up, the best land is seized by settlers; the natives are stinted either in regard to pasturage or hunting grounds. They are lured away by the attraction of high wages, and they become broken, tribeless men; imitating the worst vices of their new masters; cut off from their old nation; the authority of their chiefs gone, no authority replacing for these children of Nature that which has been destroyed.

Some of these evils are inevitable; it is the fashion to say or assume that all of them are so. . . .

If the intolerance of civilization has done harm, mischievous, too, has been the notion that the so-called un-

civilized world is made up of races all of a piece; whereas under the vague description "uncivilized" are grouped a multitude of people radically different from each other; strong and weak, good and bad, progressive and stationary; some with the self-denying virtues in which are the roots of political aptitude; others unstable, egotistical, and incohesive. . . .

The conditions of treaties between civilized governments, not uncivilized or semi-civilized communities, should be wholly different from treaties concluded between equals. I am quoting a rule of law, but one based on good sense, when I say that contracts to which minors are parties are voidable unless to their advantage. We all know how wantonly this has been disregarded; how the indigenous inhabitants have been tricked out of their lands; how a color of legality has been given to gross frauds. I fully believe that such frauds are much rarer than they were—the opportunity for them now seldom occurs. But the principle above stated needs to be set down clearly. . . .

It might also be thought a truism, were it not so often disregarded, to say that the indigenous population should have the opportunities of development in their own way—which means education suited to their needs; no forcible conformity to one type.

The principle above stated implies something of reverence —at all events respect—toward these backward races; a desire to preserve their customs and law (so far as not cruel and mischievous).

—Sir John Macdonell, Papers on Inter-Racial Problems, Extracts from pp. 404-408.

Men can have no fraternal relations until they face one another with a sense of freedom and of equal humanity.

—Walter Rauschenbusch.

Let me say that it is good for mankind that all its races do not go at the same step, that they do not all run. The reign of science has not yet begun, and only in the age of science mankind might attain to uniformity without beginning at once to decay. Dignity of life, culture, happiness, freedom, may be enjoyed by the nations moving slowly, provided they move steadily forward.

Take one common point in our destiny. We must all be immigration countries. But in order to be able to oppose to whatever foreign immigration a national spirit capable of turning it quickly into patriotic citizenship, as you do, the assimilating power of the Latin organism needs everywhere to be much increased. Immigration countries must have the necessary strength to assimilate all that they absorb. For that a strong patriotism does not suffice. Patriotism is intense in almost every nation, and in none perhaps more so than in the tribes without history. The Romans were not more patriotic than the Lusitanians. It is not patriotism that conquers immigration. Through our intercourse with you we would see what it is that conquers it. You owe your unparalleled success, as an immigration country, first of all to your political spirit. Without it you would have, owing to your soil and your race, no end of foreign guests; you would not have the endless number of citizens that they soon become here. The American political spirit is a combination of the spirit of individual liberty with the spirit of equality. Liberty alone would not convert the foreign immigrant into a new citizen; we do not hear of foreigners taking the nationality of the free European countries to which they emigrate. Equality is a more powerful agent. The European immigrant rises socially in America, and that is what makes him wish to be an American. . . . I would not end if I attempted to mention all the good that Latin America would derive from a close intercourse with the United States. What you

perhaps would prefer to hear is what good would you derive from that intercourse. I will tell you frankly that the good would be, at first, only the good that comes from making friends; but I believe there is no more substantial good than that for a nation which is the leader of a continent.

The question is to know if you have made up your mind that this continent should be for each of its nations a prolongation of her native soil; that some kind of tie should make of it a single moral unit in history.

—Joaquim Nabuco, The Approach of the Two Americas, American Association for International Conciliation, 1908, Extracts from pp. 6-8.

The contrast between Latin and Anglo-Saxon has been used constantly to support the view that close cooperation between the two races is impossible of attainment. To many writers there is an essential and fundamental antagonism between the basic racial mental and moral traits.

It is only within comparatively recent years that the pseudo-scientific form under which this doctrine has masqueraded has been unmasked. That there are differences between the Latin and the Anglo-Saxon no one will deny, but that these differences involve any essential antagonism between the two races is without any basis in scientific fact. We are gradually acquiring a clearer appreciation of the real strength of the people of Latin America and of the contributions that they have made, and are making, to the progress of western civilization.

—L. S. Rowe, Possibilities of Intellectual Cooperation Between North and South America, American Association for International Conciliation, 1908, Extract from p. 3.

Human sympathy demands respect for the sentiments and customs of every people, as being the expression of a social life and an organization dating from time immemorial.

—Giuseppe Sergi.

The time is not far distant when the Latin-American republics—or at least the more important among them—will be powers of real magnitude, whose support the United States will require in the realization of those ideals of international justice for which our government has so long striven. We cannot hope to have their support unless we are able to establish with them closer intellectual and moral bonds. The spirit of continental unity which we must try to establish does not imply the slightest antagonism toward Europe or against European institutions. It is simply the recognition of the elementary fact that America can best make her contribution to the world's progress by addressing herself primarily and with unity of purpose to those national and international problems that are either peculiar to this continent or for the solution of which conditions are peculiarly favorable.

—L. S. Rowe, Possibilities of Intellectual Cooperation Between North and South America, American Association for International Conciliation, 1908, Extract from p. 15.

The community is again insensibly divided into two camps, the repressed, who is dimly conscious that he has no adequate outlet for his normal life, and the repressive, represented by the cautious, careful citizen holding fast to his own—once more the conqueror and his humble people.

—Jane Addams, Newer Ideals of Peace, p. 61.
(The Macmillan Company, Publishers.)

It is easy to demonstrate that we consider our social and political problems almost wholly in the light of one wise

group whom we call native Americans, legislating for the members of humbler groups whom we call immigrants. The first embodies the attitude of contempt or, at best, the patronage of the successful toward those who have as yet failed to succeed. We may consider the so-called immigration situation as an illustration of our failure to treat our growing Republic in the spirit of a progressive and developing democracy.

—Ibid., Extract from p. 39.

Have we really open eyes for the hidden ideals in the lives that seem to us unlike our own—laborer, capitalist, Negro, white, educated, uneducated, quick, or slow?

—Henry Churchill King, The Ethics of Jesus.
(The Macmillan Company, Publishers.)

The great problem of nature *versus* nurture, or heredity *versus* acquirement, is insistently to the fore in any study of the relationships and relative standing in degree of civilization of human races. Is the superbly built, upstanding, high-browed Samoan of to-day a simple child of Nature because he lacks capacity, or because he lacks tradition and stimulus? I believe that it is largely because he has lacked environment, rather than heredity. And one proof is this, that he is not at all a simple child of nature where he has come into contact with those more sophisticated nature-children, ourselves. Through all the myriad Pacific Islands, the Polynesian of the "beach" is different from his blood brother of the interior. And the difference is essentially of the kind that separates us from the simpler races that we are wont to compare ourselves with. The world contact of these peoples has been simpler: the stress less. The Maoris, natives of New Zealand, simple Polynesian race, almost as primitive in their life of a generation or two ago as our own forbears for some thousands of years, are responding with amazing rapidity and success to

the stimulus and example of the modern civilization that surrounds them. Boaz's recent book, "The Mind of Primitive Man," has for principal thesis the contention of the small differences due to heredity and the large differences due to environment and individual response, among living races.

—Vernon L. Kellogg, Beyond War, Extract from pp. 99, 100. (Henry Holt & Co., Publishers.)

A special expression of progress in international morality is found in the growing recognition by governments that the obligations of the strong toward the weak are the same for nations as for individuals. A public conscience that is like the best private conscience is constantly becoming more and more a regulative force in the relations of the superior to the inferior races. . . .

Good illustrations of this quickening of the public conscience are found in England's dealings with India and China. . . . Our dealings with the island of Cuba since its liberation—opinions may differ in regard to the rightness of our original act of intervention—afford another encouraging illustration of the progress the world has made in international morality. And the same is true of our dealings with the Filipinos, notwithstanding the utterly painful character of the earlier chapters of the story. There has been no responsible official utterance on this subject that has represented our task in our acquired dependency as other than a public trust, as a guardianship to be exercised solely in the interest of the Filipinos as the nation's wards. . . . "I believe that I am speaking with historic accuracy and impartiality," declares ex-President Roosevelt, "when I say that the American treatment of and attitude toward the Filipino people, in its combination of disinterested ethical purpose and sound common sense, marks a new and long stride forward in advance of all steps that have hitherto been taken along the

path of wise and proper treatment of weaker by stronger races." This ethical purpose is especially manifested in the sending out, in the early period of our rule, of five hundred young American teachers to carry to this deeply wronged people the best we have to give—a national act without a parallel in all the history of the past.

It inspires hope in the future to note how far this last step forward carries us away from the starting point on this line of ethical advance. At first the fate of the weaker race was extermination or slavery; then its fate was to be reduced to the condition of a tributary; still later, to be subjected to commercial and industrial exploitation by the conquering people; and lastly, to be made, in theory if not yet in actual practice, the beneficiary of a benevolent self-sacrificing service.—From pp. 372-374, History as Past Ethics, by PHILIP VAN NESS MYERS; by permission of Ginn and Company, Publishers.

## A UNIVERSAL RACE CONGRESS

In July, 1911, there was held in London, at the suggestion of Dr. Felix Adler, one of the most remarkable assemblies that ever met in human history, known as the Universal Race Congress. This Congress included representatives of over forty races and nationalities. . . . German professors and high-bred English women, Americans and other representatives of the white races sat down to luncheon with men and women of all degrees of color. Learned Brahmins, an American Indian—a graduate of Dartmouth College—Cambridge professors, London and Paris economists, cultivated Negroes from America and South Africa, Turks, Egyptians, Persians, Chinese diplomates, Hungarians, Russians, men and women from all lands including one handsome Maori, here commingled as friends and neighbors, all intent on one great problem—to promote good-will and solve the problems of race

intercourse due to man's ignorance and prejudice. . . . This remarkable gathering is doubtless destined to prove the first of many triennial or quadrennial conferences which will focus the minds of scholars the world over on some of the most difficult problems which tradition and prejudice have rendered still more difficult of solution. It was hoped that one of the first steps in showing how people of culture and goodwill may transcend race prejudice in common intercourse would be the establishment in London, New York, and other great centers of an international hostel or cosmopolitan club, where people of all races, with proper credentials, would be welcomed and where distinguished foreigners would be entertained. Such centers would be potent agencies for bringing home to the representatives of the various peoples their interdependence and for promoting their influential cooperation.

—Lucia Ames Mead, Swords and Ploughshares, Extracts from pp. 62, 63.

There should be gatherings from time to time when people of different races may draw together, when the different forms which the same movement may take may be studied. If we must trust to public opinion, as is said, then public opinion should be enlightened by such gatherings as these. Sympathy ought to go hand in hand with knowledge, and it might be the object of such gatherings to study the scientific teaching. There should be more and more—and fortunately already there are many—societies representative of the interests of races. In no country, so far as I know, can governments do all that is needed; in some they may be positively hostile to objects which certain races have much at heart. Some time ago a few of my friends formed the South African Native Races Committee. Its main object was to obtain and diffuse accurate information as to the native population of South Africa. Perhaps its chief work

so far has been to bring about the formation of two similar societies in that country. Of late it has endeavored to aid in procuring funds for the establishment of a college for South African natives. I cannot but think there is plenty of room for societies with like objects.

—Sir John Macdonell, International Law and Subject Races, in Papers on Inter-Racial Problems.

## CHRISTIAN OBLIGATIONS

A man's obligation to the other man is measured by the *need* of the other man. God's obligation to man is deepest at the point of man's profoundest need. The incarnation is the divine response to that greatest human need. The thing most necessary to help man in his struggle Godward, was, we say reverently, God's highest duty to man. Christ's coming was due to no mere impulse of divine emotion. It is love working according to the profoundest laws of obligation. Human obligation obeys the same law.

—Lauress J. Birney, in The Religion of Manhood, p. 30.

The story of the dispersion at Babel presaged the national life of the Old World. During all that life the human family lived in isolated and antagonistic races and nations. It still remains there the significant fact. You go to China and the Chinese have monopolized that country; into Spain and only Spaniards are found; in France and Germany are French and Germans. Single races form not merely the numerical majority, but they are, if not the sole inhabitants, the controlling factors. Locally every race held to its own place on the face of the globe and maintained its isolated life. But this republic is a new experience. We have every year and

for a century past had great streams of populations flowing in from every race—the Anglo-Saxon, the Frenchman, the Teuton, the Scandinavian, the Italian, the Japanese, the Chinese, and the Ethiopian. They have gathered here not merely as visitors or travelers, but to stay and become citizens. The dispersion which began at Babel has ended on the banks of the Hudson and the Mississippi.

—David J. Brewer, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, the Mission of the United States in the Cause of Peace.

For a religion to be propagandist the first condition is that it must believe in the fundamental unity of mankind. A religion which admits raciality as an article of its creed confines itself within the limits of the specified race. In some religions raciality is, even if not manifested on the surface, at least so strong an undercurrent that they have no propagandist force: of living religions I take it that this is the case at present with Judaism, which maintains no propaganda, but for any expansion trusts simply to diffusion by contact. Hinduism contains many forms so much localized as to be untransferable, and even the fundamental tenets of Brahmanism are so bound up with raciality that the diffusion which is actually in process does not look beyond the boundaries of the Indian peninsula. In China the triplex system established by the State is not conceived as transferable either as a whole or in its parts, and a parallel statement is true of Japan. Expansive movement in religion has been for some time past, and is at the present moment, limited to Buddhism, Islam, and Christianity.

Buddhism in its fundamentals is free from racial limitations, and its history has shown diffusion from race to race on a large scale. Islam though closely associated with its founder and his race at once went forth with open invitation,

and though never successful in Europe had great success elsewhere, and in Africa it is expanding its range before our eyes. Christianity was in the first generation seen to be universalistic, and though its dominance was transferred from Asia into Europe, and later on it had to retreat before Islam in West Asia and North Africa, it felt that as a reproach, and in the Crusades made a protest, futile though it proved to be. At the reopening of Asia after 1453 and the discovery of the New World, Christianity resumed its world-wide prospect.

—Alfred Caldecott, Papers on Inter-Racial Problems, Extract from p. 302.

The white man whose only aim it is to be feared by the native is alike detested and detestable. He is drawing down upon himself, his country, and his race a vengeance which perhaps will only reach his sons, but which will be the more terrible in proportion as it is slow to work itself out. Thus the last word as regards the education of the native is that we must first educate the white man, cultivate the spirit of justice, sink our pride and respect the rights of others.

These high-sounding words were once words only. They were laughed at. But to-day they live, they are spread abroad, they arrest attention. Say what one will, have I not seen them triumph at the two Hague Conferences where the representatives of so-called "inferior" races have entered freely into discussion with those of the greater Powers, have secured, amid universal applause, the victory of wiser and more generous principles, and have made Force begin to bend before Right?

—Baron d'Estournelles de Constant, Papers on Inter-Racial Problems, p. 386.

There ought to be less of the intolerance of modern civiliza-

tion, equal to that of religious fanaticism; scarcely surpassed by any displayed by the Spanish conquerors of Mexico or Peru. If they were merciless, they had fewer means of carrying out their will, and they had at all events moments of contrition and doubts whether their work was altogether good in the eyes of Heaven, while the self-satisfaction of modern civilization is rarely broken by an admission of failure. . . .

The following is a remarkable confession of Lejesama, one of the first Spanish conquerors of Peru. It was sent to King Philip of Spain:

"The said Yncas, governed in such a way, that in all the land neither a thief, nor a vicious man, nor a bad, dishonest woman was known. The men all had honest and profitable employment. The woods and mines and all kinds of property were so divided that each man knew what belonged to him, and there were no law-suits. The Yncas were feared, obeyed, and respected by their subjects as a race very capable of governing. But we took away their land, and placed it under the government of Spain, and made them subjects. Your Majesty must understand that my reason for making this statement is to relieve my conscience, for we have destroyed this people by our bad examples. Crimes were once so little known among them that an Indian with one hundred thousand pieces of gold and silver in his house left it and nobody went in. But when they saw that we placed locks and keys on our doors, they understood that it was from fear of thieves, and when they saw that we had thieves among us, they despised us. All this I tell your Majesty to discharge my conscience of a weight that I may no longer be a party to these things. And I pray God to pardon me."

—Sir John Macdonell, Papers on Inter-Racial Problems, p. 404.

We get a flash of illumination from that story in the New

Testament related to the birth of Jesus. The shepherds watched their flocks by night and the heavens opened and the angels sang "Gloria in excelsis Deo!"—Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to men of His good will. That is to say, the men who have that divine good will shall have peace. According to this rendering, the song of the angels did not announce that peace should be bestowed upon all men indiscriminately—that presently there should be universal peace among men—but peace conditionally *to men who have the good will.* This is my point, that good will in the strict sense is the engine upon which we must rely to create peace. In the first place, everyone of us, instead of writing letters to the newspaper as to what the Kaiser or the Czar or someone else should do, may begin to initiate the reign of peace by creating in himself good will, especially toward the people against whom he feels objection. Some object to colored people, some to Jews, some to Poles, some to the Japanese. Almost everyone objects to one or more other races, and many people object to all races other than their own. There are also individuals that repel us, there are those whose mere faces create in us dislike. We can begin by overcoming our personal repulsions, making it our ethical purpose, if we feel strongly repelled, to try and take a friendly view of a man, to try and see the fair side of his nature. Like Saint Francis in the legend, bathe your lepers, tend those who are repugnant to you. If there is anyone whom you particularly dislike, think kindly of him at this moment. He is your leper—see whether you cannot imitate Saint Francis and be in thought and deed his friend.

—Felix Adler, in The Standard, February, 1915.

The heralds of the Son of God sang, "Glory to God in the highest and on earth peace, good will towards man." At that moment history tells us that all nations were at peace.

Throughout these twenty centuries, through all the wars of conquest and hate, that heavenly song has rung out as the hope of mankind. God has in His mind, we believe, the consummation of a world-wide peace. When or where we know not yet. The cause of truth and justice may compel its servants to obey the word of their Master, "I come not to send peace but a sword." Wars for the right are not over yet. Wars of greed, race hatred and false patriotism may be waged in future again and again. But God's Kingdom is coming, His Kingdom of Peace. In spite of disheartening checks, of cynicism and opposition, the Christian's privilege is to stand for the ideal and to work for it—work for it in the way that the heavenly choir points out, through good will. Let us respect the peoples of other races, enter with sympathy into their hopes; let us try to discover the better and not the worse in men; let us love our neighbors as ourselves. And we shall do our part in preparing the world for that lasting peace which is the crowning virtue and happiness of all people.

—William Lawrence, The Church and the Ideal, pp. 7, 8.

## CHAPTER IX

## WORLD FEDERATION, A MEANS OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE

The great achievement that calls for your patient labor, your heroic endeavor, it may be for the sacrifice of your heart's blood, is the achievement of the unity of the world, the federation of mankind, the evolution of the Universal World State.

—William T. Stead.

### JUSTICE NECESSARY TO PEACE

Peace can never be except as it is founded upon justice. And it rests with us in our own country to see to it that the idea of justice prevails, and prevails against the declamation of the demagogue, against the interested exhortation of the politician, against the hot temper of the thoughtless and of the inconsiderate. If we would have peace, it is not enough to cry "Peace! Peace!" It is essential that we should promote and insist upon the willingness of our country to do justice to all countries of the earth. In the exercise of those duties in which the ambassadors of Great Britain, of Brazil, and of Japan have played so great a part with us in the last few years in Washington, the great obstacles to the doing of things which make for peace have been not the wish of the diplomatist, not the policy of the government, but the inconsiderate and thoughtless unwillingness of the great body of the people of the respective countries to stand behind the

man who was willing for the sake of peace and justice to make fair concessions.

—Elihu Root, Causes of War, pp. 4, 5, in Documents of the American Association for International Conciliation, 1909.

What we are seeking I think—certainly what I desire—is not merely peace, but peace founded on righteousness, peace accompanying justice, peace with law and order as its components. What we are seeking is, first justice and then peace. "If it be possible, as much as lies in you," says the apostle, "live peaceably with all men." —Lyman Abbott.

He who would insure peace—aye, he who would bring peace in its full true meaning—must endeavor to build the very foundations of the State upon the firm rock of justice. War comes from injustice; peace comes from justice, from the securing to each man of that which is his due.

—Henry George.

War will never yield but to the principles of universal justice and love, and those have no sure root but in the religion of Jesus Christ.

—William E. Channing.

We can never undo what has been done, and we cannot stop what is going on; but what we can do is to help to prepare a new order in which these things will never occur again. —Baroness von Suttner.

Without justice we can have no guarantee of permanent peace. With justice the peace of the world is unassailable. There are words in an old poem very familiar to many generations of Englishmen, and in some sort familiar no doubt to

our foreign friends, which often occur to my mind in relation to this thought. The words as we use them run thus: "Mercy and truth have met together, righteousness and peace have kissed each other." Righteousness and peace; or, as we say now, justice and peace. Without righteousness, no peace; with righteousness, perpetual peace. Think of it. When justice is once enthroned and in possession there must be a perpetual desire to overthrow the injustice, and to establish right in its place. And when injustice possesses the minds of nations or rulers there is a perpetual instinct to be unjust, and to establish that order against which we have to rebel. . . .

How shall we get among the nations what we have succeeded in obtaining within nations—a reference to law instead of to force—an appeal to the privileges and powers of society for enforcing justice instead of a resort on one's own account to the force which one may command to compel justice?

The first thing is to use all your powers, all your opportunities to develop the strength, the scope, the purity of international law. Do as much as you can as individuals, influence your rulers as much as you can as citizens of free communities, to develop, strengthen, and purify international law—international law which rises above the separate nations just as the municipal law of a community rises above its separate citizens. . . .

Underlying all notions of international law, underlying all the ideas which are developed in these private treaties, the great security of peace is to be found in the recognition by the members of different communities of their kinship with the members of other communities, of the notion of a common manhood if not of a common citizenship. Here we have the supreme guarantee of perpetual peace. Try to get it—and this is the glory, this is the defense, this is the justifica-

tion of all your actions by bringing together representatives of the different States of Europe and America—try to get the peoples to understand one another.

—Lord Courtney, Peace by Justice, in Publications of the National Peace Council, Extracts from pp. 3-7.

We know that many will doubt the influence and security of our country among the nations, armed with justice rather than with power, but let them remember this outstanding fact: that both her influence and her security have never depended upon her power but upon just these moral qualities. *It has actually been her justice and not her arms* that has made her heeded of the world! When the Boxer trouble occurred in China, it was in our nation that China put her trust and confidence, and it was our words she heeded above the great armed powers. When the President of the United States intervened between warring Japan and Russia, both nations heeded us, not because of any army or navy, but because they believed that we loved justice and were disinterested people.

It is admitted by all that at the second Hague Conference the United States carried most weight and that every nation listened when she spoke. But it was not because of a big stick behind our words. It was because the nations trusted and respected us. It is to the United States that the South American nations turn in any trouble—and would turn oftener were we more just—not because of our armament, but because they believe in us. The formation of the Pan-American Union in Washington and the building of the palace by Mr. Carnegie, which is its home, gave the United States more influence in South America than twenty new battleships would have done. Indeed these states never began to distrust us until we used force and began to talk of big

navies. The United States was just as much a world power before she had a great navy as she is to-day.

—Frederick Lynch, What Makes a Nation Great, Extract from pp. 37, 38.

There can be no doubt whatever that during recent years, and especially in the more democratic countries, an international consensus of public opinion has gradually grown up, making itself the voice, like a Greek chorus, of an abstract justice. It is quite true that of this justice, as of justice generally, it may be said that it has wide limits. Renan declared once, in a famous allocution, that "what is called indulgence is, most often, only justice," and, at the other extreme, Remy de Gourmont has said that "injustice is sometimes a part of justice"; in other words, there are varying circumstances in which justice may properly be tempered either with mercy or with severity. In any case, and however it may be qualified, a popular international voice generously pronouncing itself in favor of justice, and resonantly condemning any government which clashes against justice, is now a factor of the international situation. It is, moreover, tending to become a factor having a certain influence on affairs. This was the case during the South African War, when England, by offending this international sense of justice, fell into a discredit which had many actual unpleasant results and narrowly escaped, there is some reason to believe, proving still more serious. The same voice was heard with dramatically sudden and startling effect when Ferrer was shot at Barcelona. Ferrer was a person absolutely unknown to the man in the street; he was indeed little more than a name even to those who knew Spain; few could be sure, except by a kind of intuition, that he was the innocent victim of a judicial murder, for it is only now that the fact is being slowly placed beyond dispute. Yet immediately after Ferrer

was shot within the walls of Monjuich a great shout of indignation was raised, with almost magical suddenness and harmony, throughout the civilized world, from Italy to Belgium, from England to Argentina. Moreover, this voice was so decisive and so loud that it acted like those legendary trumpet-blasts which shattered the walls of Jericho; in a few days the Spanish Government, with a powerful minister at its head, had fallen. The significance of this event we cannot easily overestimate. For the first time in history, the voice of international public opinion, unsupported by pressure, political, social or diplomatic, proved potent enough to avenge an act of injustice by destroying a government. A new force has appeared in the world, and it tends to operate against those countries which are guilty of injustice, whether that injustice is exerted against a State or even only against a single obscure individual. The modern developments of telegraphy and the press—unfavorable as the press is in many respects to the cause of international harmony—have placed in the hands of peace this new weapon against war.

—Havelock Ellis, The Forces Warring Against War, pp. 3, 4.

There was a time when we thought violence had been quarantined. We expected there would be fighting in Africa and revolutions in South American republics, but we did not expect violence to become epidemic. We thought that the reign of peace and good will among Christian nations was assured by the providential discovery of smokeless powder, submarine torpedo boats, and other agents of a beneficently systematized slaughter. We almost regretted the civilizing of the Red Man, since it shut the door of rapid promotion to West Point graduates.

But apparently our dreams were the results of ill-digested optimism. Despite the prophecies of the poet, the reign of

violence is not yet over, and peace seems impatient of anything but a bloody wooing. . . .

Nor has it been the soldier alone who would build up a better future by a recourse to force.

The "educational committee" of the labor union ushers in the reign of fraternity by terrifying nonunion girls and killing nonunion men.

Employers' Associations, scorning the elemental brutality of cavemen, starve recalcitrant employees into peace as their feudal prototypes starved a town into consenting to be sacked.

Ecclesiastical bodies cure heresy by ruining the reputation of heretics.

Mobs lynch Negroes.

And Christian nations in the interest of commerce partition empires, appropriate new continents, and maintain order in an African Free State by mutilating natives who refuse to tap rubber trees. Scratch civilization and you will find something far worse than a Cossack. . . .

And yet it is not because men have grown more savage that they thus invite deadly struggle. They were never more prodigal in their charities. The nation that invents new guns and new armor organizes a Red Cross League to care for the victims of its inventions. It is not that the better men among us have new lust for violence. It is, rather, that the ruling and the subject peoples and classes have grown desperate. Peace and love and self-sacrifice seem for the moment terms of an impracticable rhetoric. In momentary despair of other methods of reaching peace men have dressed up their passions in the guise of some good cause, and, as always, believe that uniforms justify violence. . . .

It is not difficult to understand this desperation. What man of us has not chafed under injustice or ingratitude and longed to call down fire from heaven upon inhospitable Samaritans? Why not treat brutes as they would treat us?

It is no easy thing for a man, much less a nation, to be strong and gentle, self-reliant and patient.

Yet to this peace men and nations must some day come and, despite recent history, are coming. Besides the recurrence to brute force there is also in world politics and industrial struggles a recognition of the final value of the Golden Rule. The Hague Tribunal and arbitration treaties are not ghosts of dead optimisms.

It is not merely that men believe war of every sort to be fearfully costly. Economic arguments, and the gains of a commercial war may be judged greater than the penalties of increased national debts and bankrupt merchants. National and industrial peace must be built on something more fundamental than profit and loss accounts.

It must be, nay, it is being built upon a recognition of elemental justice.

Madness may have seized the world for the moment, but brute force cannot always be the court of final appeal. To believe otherwise is to misread the past and misjudge the signs of the times.

—Shailer Mathews, The Making of To-Morrow, Extract from pp. 129-133.

The simplest and most fundamental quality needed in the moral relations of men is justice. We can gauge the ethical importance of justice by the sense of outrage with which we instinctively react against injustice. If redress is denied us, we feel the foundations of the moral universe totter. Men have often gone to law and used up all their hard-earned property to satisfy their craving for justice, and if they thought it was permanently denied them, their whole nature has become hard and bitter. Until injustice between individuals is made right by restoration or forgiveness, fraternity between them is cleft, and only heroic love on the part of the

wronged can bridge the gap. For a man who has overreached or wronged his neighbor, to offer him favors or charity is felt to add insult to injury. If he loves him, let him love him enough to be just to him.

So fundamental is justice between man and man. One of the prime requisites of a righteous social order, therefore, is to provide wise and prompt social tribunals to settle cases where private justice is in dispute. . . .

As justice is the condition of good will between individuals, so it is the foundation of the social order. Any deep-seated injustice throws the foundation walls out of plumb. If one class is manifestly exploiting another, there is no fraternity between them. Long-standing oppression has sometimes so dulled the manhood of a peasant class that they accepted injustice as part of the inevitable suffering of life, and received any act of justice from the aristocracy with enthusiasm as a noble and generous deed. Such patience is really the most pathetic symptom of degradation. But the fact that the oppressing classes have always vigilantly suppressed any social or religious agitation that might waken the drugged sense of justice, shows that such peace is always superficial. If any one can read history without a sickening sense of the enormous extent of injustice and oppression in all nations, he has a mental make-up which I both envy and abhor. Practically all the internal upheavals recorded in history were caused by the agonized attempts of inferior classes to resist or shake off the clutch of injustice. Nations die of legalized injustice.

—Walter Rauschenbusch, Christianizing the Social Order, p. 40.

**JUSTICE AND FRIENDSHIP**

It will be worthy of a free, enlightened and at no distant period a great nation to give to mankind the magnanimous

and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it: can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue?

In the execution of such a plan nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others should be excluded; and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings toward all should be cultivated. . . . Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty, of nations has been the victim.

—Washington's Farewell Address.

The willingness to do justice in a nation to every brother of our common land is the ideal of self-government.

—Elihu Root.

Our business, using the word broadly, is no longer merely the business of our little neighborhood, our city, our state,

our nation. It is the business of the whole world. We cannot calmly regard injustice to a Chinaman or Jew or Armenian or Spaniard or black man. We may not, without accusing consciences, as a nation commit injustice upon another nation. Our actions must measure up to the standard of justice required by all the civilized nations of the world. . . .

The self-respect and the desire for the respect of others which prevent a stronger man from committing actions of physical oppression upon a weaker one is beginning to have its effect upon the dealings of a great nation with its smaller brothers. And this feeling grows, as I have indicated, out of the regard each has for the other, proceeding from the realization of the benefits each brings to the common service of humanity. It is easier to be brutal to a slave or one unprotected by public opinion than to injure a coworker who brings to our common store experiences or qualities mutually advantageous.

—Jackson H. Ralston, Forces Making for International Conciliation and Peace, p. 18, in Documents of The American Association for International Conciliation, 1911.

Let us help one another to show that for all the races of men the liberty for which we have fought and labored is the twin sister of justice and peace. —Elihu Root.

We must learn to bring to the consideration of public business in its international aspects what I may call the international mind, and the international mind is still rarely to be found in high places. That the international mind is not inconsistent with sincere and devoted patriotism is clearly shown by the history of the great Liberal statesmen of the nineteenth century who had to deal with the making of

Europe as we know it. If Lord Palmerston had the international mind not at all, surely Mr. Gladstone had it in high degree. The late Marquis of Salisbury, whom no one ever accused of lacking devotion to national policies and purposes, had it also, although a Tory of the Tories. Cavour certainly had it, as did Thiers. Lord Morley has it, and so has his colleague Lord Haldane. The late Senator Hoar had it when on a somewhat important occasion he expressed the hope that he should never so act as to place his country's interests above his country's honor. It was the possession of this international mind that gave to the brilliant administrations of Secretary Hay and Secretary Root their distinction and their success. The lack of it has marked other administrations of foreign affairs, both in the United States and European countries, either with failure or with continuing and strident friction.

What is this international mind, and how are we to seek for it and to gain it as a possession of our own and of our country? The international mind is nothing else than that habit of thinking of foreign relations and business, and that habit of dealing with them, which regard the several nations of the civilized world as friendly and cooperating equals in aiding the progress of civilization, in developing commerce and industry, and in spreading enlightenment and culture throughout the world. It is as inconsistent with the international mind to attempt to steal some other nation's territory as it would be inconsistent with the principles of ordinary morality to attempt to steal some other individual's purse. Magnitude does not justify us in dispensing with morals.

—Nicholas Murray Butler, The International Mind, pp. 101-103. (Permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.)

We Americans need the international mind as much as any people ever needed it. We shall never be able to do justice

to our better selves or to take our true part in the modern world until we acquire it. We must learn to suppress rather than to exalt those who endeavor, whether through ignorance, selfishness, or malice, to stir among us antagonism to other nations and to other people. If we are to take the place which many of us have fondly hoped America would take, at the very forefront of the movement for the establishment of a world peace based upon even-handed justice, we must first learn to rule our tongues and to turn deaf ears to those who, from time to time, endeavor to lead us away from the path of international rectitude and international honor with false cries of a pseudo-patriotism.—IBID., pp. 107, 108.

(Permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.)

The newer ideals of peace are active and dynamic, and it is believed that if their forces were made really operative upon society, they would, in the end, quite as a natural process, do away with war. The older ideals have required fostering and recruiting, and have been held and promulgated on the basis of a creed. Their propaganda has been carried forward during the last century in nearly all civilized countries by a small body of men who have never ceased to cry out against war and its iniquities and who have preached the doctrines of peace along two great lines. The first has been the appeal to the higher imaginative pity, as it is found in the modern, moralized man. This line has been most effectively followed by two Russians, Count Tolstoy in his earlier writings and Verestchagin in his paintings. With his relentless power of reducing all life to personal experience Count Tolstoy drags us through the campaign of the common soldier in its sordidness and meanness and constant sense of perplexity. We see nothing of the glories we have associated with warfare, but learn of it as it appears to the untutored peasant who goes forth at the mandate of his

superior to suffer hunger, cold, and death for issues which he does not understand, which indeed can have no moral significance to him. Verestchagin covers his canvas with thousands of wretched wounded and neglected dead, with the waste, cruelty, and squalor of war, until he forces us to question whether a moral issue can ever be subserved by such brutal methods.

High and searching as is the preaching of these two great Russians who hold their art of no account save as it serves moral ends, it is still the appeal of dogma, and may be reduced to a command to cease from evil. And when this same line of appeal is presented by less gifted men, it often results in mere sentimentality, totally unenforced by a call to righteousness.

The second line followed by the advocates of peace in all countries has been the appeal to the sense of prudence, and this again has found its ablest exponent in a Russian subject, the economist and banker, Jean de Bloch. He sets forth the cost of warfare with pitiless accuracy, and demonstrates that even the present armed peace is so costly that the burdens of it threaten social revolution in almost every country in Europe. Long before the reader comes to the end of de Bloch's elaborate computation he is ready to cry out on the inanity of the proposition that the only way to secure eternal peace is to waste so much valuable energy and treasure in preparing for war that war becomes impossible. Certainly no theory could be devised which is more cumbersome, more roundabout, more extravagant, than the *reductio ad absurdum* of the peace-secured-by-the-preparation-for-war theory. . . .

An English writer has recently bidden us to look at the actual state of affairs. He says, "Universal and permanent peace may be a vision; but the gradual change whereby war as a normal state of international relations has given place

to peace as the normal state, is no vision, but an actual process of history palpably forwarded in our own day by the development of international law and of morals, and voluntary arbitration based thereon." He insisted that it is the function of international lawyers merely to give coherent expression to the best principles which the common moral sense of civilized government recognizes; in other words, that international law should be like primitive law within the nation, a formal expression of custom resting on the sense of a reciprocal restraint which has been found to be necessary for the common good.

Assuming that the two lines of appeal—the one to sensibility and the other to prudence—will persist, and that the international lawyers, in spite of the fact that they have no court before which to plead and no executive to enforce their findings, will continue to formulate into codes the growing moral sense of the nations, the following pages hope not only to make clear the contention that these forces within society are so dynamic and vigorous that the impulses to war seem by comparison cumbersome and mechanical, but also to point out the development of those newer social forces which it is believed will at last prove a "sovereign intervention" by extinguishing the possibility of battle at its very source.

It is difficult to formulate the newer dynamic peace, embodying the later humanism, as over against the old dogmatic peace. The word "non-resistance" is misleading, because it is much too feeble and inadequate. It suggests passivity, the goody-goody attitude of ineffectiveness. The words "overcoming," "substituting," "recreating," "readjusting moral values," "forming new centers of spiritual energy," carry much more of the meaning implied. For it is not merely the desire for a conscience at rest, for a sense of justice no longer outraged that would pull us into new paths where there would be no more war nor preparations for war.

There are still more strenuous forces at work reaching down to impulses and experience as primitive and profound as are those of struggle itself. That "ancient kindliness which sat beside the cradle of the race," and which is ever ready to assert itself against ambition and greed and the desire for achievement, is manifesting itself now with unusual force, and for the first time presents international aspects.

Moralists agree that it is not so much by the teaching of moral theorems that virtue is to be promoted as by the direct expression of social sentiments and by the cultivation of practical habits; that in the progress of society sentiments and opinions have come first, then habits of action, and lastly moral codes and institutions. Little is gained by creating the latter prematurely, but much may be accomplished to the utilization of human interests and affections. The Advocates of Peace would find the appeal both to Pity and Prudence totally unnecessary, could they utilize the cosmopolitan interests in human affairs with the resultant social sympathy that is developing among all the nations of the earth.

—Jane Addams, Newer Ideals of Peace, Extracts from pp. 4-9. (The Macmillan Company, Publishers.)

Disarmament is the result and peace is the cause, not disarmament the cause and peace the result. To take the arms away from those who are under control and leave them in the hands of those who are not under control, to take them away from the police and put them in the hands of the black-handers, is not the way to peace. To take away armaments from those nations that know how to use them and to leave them in the hands of those nations that do not know the power of self-restraint, that are without the self-control that is necessary to an armed nation, is not the pathway to international peace. To take arms away from the highest, the best and most cultured nations and leave them in the hands

of the least cultured is not to prepare for the Kingdom of God. "The Kingdom of God is righteousness and peace and joy and holiness of spirit." There is no peace not founded on good will, and also there is no good will not founded on righteousness. Righteousness first, peace next, universal welfare last of all.

—Lyman Abbott, in the Reports of the Third American Peace Congress, 1911, p. 248.

## THE MEANING OF WORLD FEDERATION

Federation, in the pacifist sense, means, of course, "such a juridical union between independent States as shall provide peaceful and rational methods of settling all questions arising out of their mutual relations, eliminating every ground for resort to brute force, but not interfering with autonomy." Nor does it seem unreasonable to look for some such fruitage as this from the increasing tendency of civilized countries to submit their differences to arbitration. It is even possible that a really adequate supremacy of arbitral justice may prove unattainable unless accompanied by some such form of federal union as the late Lord Salisbury held to be "the only possible structure of Europe which can save civilization from a desolating disaster of war."

—William Leighton Grane, The Passing of War, Extract from p. 285. (The Macmillan Company, Publishers.)

The movement of civilization is toward a new conception of the State, not as a "power," but as a center of jurisdiction. Its main function is not as in medieval times to exercise force beyond its borders, or to bring unwilling peoples under its sway, but rather to maintain peace and justice within its limits, other states having outside its boundaries the same function exercised in a similar way. . . .

Viewed as a "power" in the medieval sense, Germany, for

example, is crowded and hampered on every side. She is largely shut off from the sea on the one side, from the Orient on the other. Millions of people of German blood are cut off by the boundaries, becoming citizens of Austria or Switzerland, instead of Germany. Her boundaries north, east, and west, are marked by giant fortresses and scarred by old wars, while the oversea dependencies, the glory and the cost of modern empire, nearly all worth having were preempted before the modern Empire of Germany was born. Even the German Rhine is German for its middle part only, and of the Danube, the navigable part begins where Germany leaves off.

But considered as a modern state, Germany suffers nothing from these limitations. Her power is quite as adequate to look after the welfare of her people as though no limitations existed. Her universities are just as great, her factories as busy, her people as prosperous as though the whole land from the Bosporus to the British Channel were under the German flag. Her people, when passing the borders outside the German jurisdiction, find no lack of justice, no increase of taxation. The flag of civilization floats over all.

Considered as a "power," the great State of Illinois, one tenth as populous as Germany, is hampered in a similar way. She reaches neither sea nor mountains, and her navigable rivers are shared with a dozen other states. But no citizen of Illinois ever felt himself cramped by these misfortunes. Illinois is a modern state, a region of jurisdiction and not a "power," or center of military force.

Similarly, Germany, France, England, the United States, as civilization progresses, must cease to be "powers" to become part of the organized civilization of the earth. When each state accepts this attitude, becoming the representative of its people and trusting other states in like fashion, we shall realize the ideals of international peace. These ideals are not realized in the conditions of peace in Europe to-day.

These conditions have been defined as "bankruptcy armed to the teeth," which, as Gambetta once said, shall find its final climax in "a beggar sitting by a barrack door."

International peace means mutual respect and mutual trust, a condition in which the boundary line between states is not a line of suspicion and hate, but, like the boundaries of provinces, a convenience in judicial and administrative adjustments. Such a boundary as this is found in the four-thousand-mile line which separates Canada from the United States, an undefended border which for a hundred years has not known a fortress nor a warship nor a gun. There is nothing of which the two great North American nations have a greater right to be proud than this boundary of trust and confidence. It is the beginning of the new era, the era of justice and peace among the nations.

The end of our efforts is found in the conception of peace through law. A natural law is the expression of the way in which things normally come about. Human law is the expression of the best relations among men. In war, the conceptions of right and duty disappear. In arms, the laws are silent. Worse ways of doing things take the place of better, to the detriment of society and of the individual man.

The whole movement of civilization has been from strife toward order. In barbarism, every man's hand is against every other. In barbarism, the life of every man and woman is a tragedy. As man has risen cooperation has taken the place of compulsion. Men have brought peace to their families and their neighborhoods by working together to exclude war. They have learned more and more to leave their differences to the decision of others, either through arbitral settlement or judicial decision. The one brings about a condition of mutual tolerance; the other strives toward ideal justice. And in the world of to-day both

methods find their center in the councils and tribunals at The Hague.

In such fashion, step by step, men have passed from tribal wars, municipal wars, struggles of robber barons, and of rival dynasties, marauding expeditions, holy wars and wars unholy, to relative peace within the borders of the nation. The only place where killing on a large scale is legalized is on the line where great nations meet. Along these borders to-day the most crushing burdens of war machinery the world has ever imagined are steadily piling up. All this is avowedly in the interest of final peace, of "peace by preponderance," the peace of dread and dreadnaughts, the peace which is the twin sister of war, and the greater the "peace establishments" thus built up, the more frequent are the war scares and the more insistent the danger of actual war. . . .

The growth of popular government makes everywhere for better understanding among men, and groups of men who know each other recognize their common humanity and common interests as far outweighing their desire for fight.

Along the international borders, or at times the boundaries of races, ill-feeling and violence are most likely to appear. Across these same borders a thousand emissaries for good are also passing, from day to day. The missionary has been a powerful agency for peace. So, likewise, are the commercial traveler, the board of trade, the international commission, the world congress, and all other agencies for bringing men together on the basis of common interest and common trust. The world over, men engaged in similar work, though in different nations, have more in common than the men of the different groups within a single nation.

—David Starr Jordan, War and Waste,
Extracts from pp. 3-8.

The world has progressed, and a federation of the states

of the world is no longer the mere conception of a philosophic dreamer. The first step will be taken when two of the leading countries of the world—and it would be most reasonable for the states having the closest community of origin and language to take the initiative—resolve to submit all their differences without reserve to arbitration. As soon as a third power of magnitude joined this federation the nucleus would be constituted of a world state. Such a state would be able to impose peace on even the most recalcitrant outside states, for it would furnish that "visible power to keep them in awe," which Hobbes rightly declared to be indispensable; it could even, in the last resort, if necessary, enforce peace by war. Thus there might still be war in the world. But there would be no wars that were not Holy Wars. There are other methods than war of enforcing peace, and these such a federation of great states would be easily able to bring to bear on even the most warlike of states.

—Havelock Ellis, The Forces Warring Against War, p. 19.

What the Nature of Things will yet do with the United States remains to be seen. So far as our Constitution is in accord with the supreme, unwritten constitution, it is in an impregnable stronghold and no might of man can destroy it. But wherever it is not in accord, or is so interpreted as not to be in working accord, then the Nature of Things will have no more regard for the written Constitution than a tornado has for the straws in its path. Fundamental rights of man and the true obligations and responsibilities of nations lie in the world constitution, back of all written agreements or treaties, or human understandings whatever, and they will triumph at last, provided men are unselfish enough and brave enough to die for their rights—and martyrs have never yet been lacking when the cause was clear. . . .

World peace may be much nearer than the hopeless and the doubters suppose. Humanity is even now becoming organized into one whole. The idea of world unity is stronger to-day than it ever was before. Expectation of the realization of the inspiring ideal is spreading among those who watch the signs of the times. Familiarity with the facts only strengthens this confidence. The example of the United States is in itself a proof which will do much to convince the political leaders of our country and to persuade the statesmen of Europe, Asia, South America, and other lands that the truth is applicable to all mankind and that in the realization of this ideal will come permanent peace and prosperity with practical enjoyment of the brotherhood of man.

Absolute sovereignty having been waived by the agreement of the nations to enter into a regular international congress, there would follow participation in regulations tending to establish similar conditions around the world among all nations represented in the congress. In the United States over thirty states and territories have joined the effort for larger unity in state procedure by the appointment of commissioners on the uniformity of legislation. Effort in a similar direction would be one of the earliest necessities felt by a world legislature. Indeed, there is in sight already in this and other fields abundance of material for world legislation for several sessions.

—Raymond L. Bridgman, World Organization, Extracts from pp. 134-142.

## INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

The significance of the Interparliamentary Union lies in the fact that it is composed of members of the Parliaments, and that they view problems in government from an international standpoint. Scientists, educators, and postal officials had held universal congresses to consider matters of common

interest among the nations. Government executives and diplomatists of necessity take an international point of view of things. But until this Union came into existence it was the custom of legislators, except as they passed upon the merits of a treaty or some special subject of international relations, to confine themselves to interests within the geographical limits of their own country. This organization is also significant because the ideas of arbitration and peace, which in the pioneer days of the past were advocated chiefly by peace societies and humanitarians, are now being adopted by practical politicians and statesmen. It also means that the international attitude of a government is no longer to be left to rulers and their cabinets, but more and more to be the subject of legislative action and the theme of popular discussion. At the outset the Union urged the importance of having the popular will in international relations expressed by the direct vote of the people. . . .

Since internationalism has come to be one of the most important interests of the day, the project of a world-congress of the nations, proposed more than half a century ago by Elihu Burritt, has been more and more prominently brought forward by the friends of peace. The Interparliamentary Union in advocating periodic meetings of the Hague Conference has practically indorsed the idea of such a congress. In 1906 the suggestion was made by Mr. Bartholdt that perhaps at first delegates from the Union might act as the lower house or popular branch, and the delegates to the Hague Conference, who are appointed by the government executives, might serve as the upper house of the world-congress.

In connection with periodic meetings of the Hague Conference, the Union desires to have provision made for a permanent consultative council, to be charged with the codification and development of international law.

At conferences held some years ago it discussed the matter of protection to be given to foreign residents and non-combatants during hostilities. It has always stood for the inviolability of private property at sea in time of war. It strongly urged the consideration of the limitation of armaments by the second Hague Conference.

Preventive measures and methods of conciliation have at times been brought forward in its proceedings. A resolution passed in 1889 made it the duty of one of its committees "to unite all its efforts for dissipating the misunderstandings which might arise (in the interval before its next meeting) by making, if need be, an appeal to public opinion." At the meeting of the Union, which was held in the Westminster Chamber, London, July, 1906, at the suggestion of Hon. William J. Bryan, who made a notable speech on the subject, it passed a resolution providing that in case of controversies not usually included in treaties of arbitration, meaning matters affecting vital interests or national honor, demand shall be made by one or both opponents for an investigation of the contested issues by an international commission of inquiry, or for mediation by one or more friendly powers, before having recourse to measures of hostility.

—James L. Tryon, The Interparliamentary Union and Its Work, Extracts from pp. 2-6.

### THE NEED OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

In our advocacy of international institutions we have gained only the less important goal should we achieve the establishment of a judicature empowered to enforce the law as it is plainly recognized by all. If we are to deprive war more completely of its *raison d'être,* it will be necessary that there be found methods of developing international law so as to make it correspond to the vital needs of mankind and to render recurrence to violent means of vindicating rights

less and less excusable. The great international conferences are a beginning of a legislative body, but as yet they are much hampered by diplomatic considerations. A world-legislation decreeing laws by majority of votes is still in the distant future and would involve a total departure from our present system of autonomous nations. Is there an agency by which international law could be developed gradually but on the basis of principles that would in themselves make possible, and in fact import, recognition also by a world conference with legislative attributes? We believe that for the time being definiteness in international law principles could be achieved best, if they were hammered out in such important litigation as would come before high courts of international judicature. Growing from precedent to precedent, adapting itself always more perfectly to the needs of the world, resting on principles of human reason tested in action, international law could grow strong in importance and authority. For by judicial interpretation conflicting points of view are dissolved, the better reason is gradually allowed to establish itself, new implications are seen in older and accepted principles, which in turn will be a guidance in the just settlement of controversies as they arise. Thus the law is conceived of as a growing, living organism not subject to artificial construction by wrong-headed caprice no matter how strongly endowed with temporary power.

It is this kind of jurisprudence that Americans are thinking of when they raise their voice for a high international judicature. It has been their experience for centuries, here and through the English system inherited by us, that law grows gradually by the application of human reason and experience to innumerable cases. . . .

When we review the elements composing the American policy of international peace and arbitration and realize their intimate connection with the fundamental experience and

ideals of our national life, we may indeed justly be filled with joy and satisfaction because a policy so noble and humane flows naturally from the fundamental conditions of our national existence; but we will also realize the high responsibility herein laid upon our government not to allow these principles ever to be made the means for advancing interests of a petty, selfish nature. The danger is constantly present that through the desire of gaining a petty advantage we may forfeit a large measure of that opportunity which our favorable position gives us to be instrumental in the establishment of broad, statesmanlike action in the affairs of the world. *Noblesse oblige;* the marvelous advantages lavished upon us by nature are also an obligation for us not to descend to bending the foreign policy of this majestic commonwealth to petty aims of temporary advantage. . . .

The treatment accorded to international treaties obtained with great effort by the executive, which represent the carrying out of our declared and avowed policy, is often short-viewed. In all these matters, we seem to lose sight of the cost of such inconsistencies in weakening our position when it comes to really fundamental policies.

—Paul S. Reinsch, American Love of Peace and European Skepticism; in pp. 9-14, Documents of The American Association for International Conciliation, 1913.

The peace movement, we have now come to realize, is nothing but the process of substituting law for war. The world has already learned to substitute law for war in hamlets, towns, cities, states and even within the forty-six sovereign civilized nations. But in that international realm over and above each nation in which each nation is equally sovereign, the only way at the present moment for a nation to secure its rights is by the use of force. Force, therefore, or war—as

it is called when exerted by a nation against another nation —is at present the only legal and final method of settling international differences. The world is now using a Christian code of ethics for individuals and a pagan code for nations, though there is no double standard of ethics in the moral world. In other words, the nations are in that state of civilization where without a qualm they claim the right to settle their disputes in a manner which they would actually put their own subjects to death for imitating. Thus the peace problem is nothing but the ways and means of doing between the nations what has already been done within the nations. International law follows private law. The "United Nations" follow the United States.

—Hamilton Holt, in the Reports of the Third American Peace Congress, p. 7.

One of the sanctions of war which the militarist puts forward as something not to be questioned is that it has often been the only means of securing justice, or conversely, of resisting injustice. And yet the war method of settling disputes is the very antithesis of fair dealing. Nothing can be further from the ideals of justice than to allow contestants individually to pass upon the merits of their controversy and to appeal to arms if their demands are not acceded to. Such appeals do not settle disputes on the basis of justice at all. They decide "not who is right but only who is strong." They are like the *code duello* under which two men agree to carry their dispute to the so-called "field of honor." The skillfulest man wins, right or wrong. If justice win, it is by accident. So in war the righteousness of a cause, though an aid, is no sure guaranty of success. Providence (*alias* success) is on the side of the heaviest battalions. Victory, often as not, means the reversal of justice, and war to that extent is an instrument of injustice. As a means of settling international

disputes it is at best a necessary evil and its use is justifiable only to the extent that a better substitute has not been found. The time will come when the world will marvel that it should so long have chosen to travel so rough a road, just as it now wonders at its former universal belief in slavery and other barbarous institutions. That a cannon, a submarine mine, or a torpedo boat should have any part in the administration of international justice will yet appear quite as preposterous as now appears the discarded use of instruments of torture in promoting the true interests of Church or State.

—Hiram M. Chittenden, Brigadier-General U. S. A.,
War or Peace, Extract from pp. 33, 34.

**THE WORLD COURT**

The world court would carry the probability of peace to a certainty. As our national courts have jurisdiction over issues involving parties other than the residents of one state, so the world court would be a tribunal before which national differences could be tried and settled by the highest judicial ability the human race could produce. Nations would be in their organic relation to one another as parts of the common whole. Occasion for differences would be reduced to such minor matters that not only would the honor of each contestant be satisfied by the court procedure, but the material interests of each would be promoted far more than by any possible resort to force. For it must be remembered in connection with the truth that only minor matters as judged by present issues would come before that court, that in the relations of the nations there could arise no question of the destruction of one nation by another. By the free opportunities for race expansion into territories of other races offered to all who desired to trade or travel or live elsewhere, world law would remove all pretext for resort to force. More than that, the public opinion of the entire world would be

against any one Power which would undertake to destroy the existence of any other, however small. And the concert itself illustrates the growing and tremendous strength of world opinion, especially when backed by the moral law.

Other questions than existence or integrity of territory would be settled by the world court, and the public opinion of the world would be powerful to influence the losing side to accept the verdict without resort to force. In any event acceptance would not involve dishonor in the eyes of others, because it would be a verdict by the world court and acceptance would certainly entail less loss of prestige or property—to say nothing of life—than a resort to arms.

—Raymond L. Bridgman, World Organization,
Extract from pp. 143, 144.

Though I have been trained a soldier, and have participated in many battles, there never was a time when, in my opinion, some way could not have been found of preventing the drawing of the sword. I look forward to an epoch when a court, recognized by all nations, will settle international differences, instead of keeping large standing armies, as they do in Europe. —General Ulysses S. Grant.

As the Congress of Montevideo to advance private international law was the forerunner of the congresses of The Hague, which met for the same purpose, so is it to be hoped that the Central American Court of Justice may be the forerunner of a Court of Justice organized by all nations for all nations. —Simeon E. Baldwin.

The Princes of Europe should establish one Sovereign Assembly, before which all international differences should be brought, which cannot be settled by the Embassies.

—William Penn.

Unhappily there is no International Tribunal to which the cases can be referred, and there is no International Law by which the parties can be required to refer their disputes. *If such a Tribunal existed, it would be a great benefit to the civilized world.*

—Earl Derby.

The ideal international grand jury would act for each member of the family of nations, large or small, just as surely and potently as it would for any of the others. The United States Senate committee's warning, that "if we enter into these treaties with Great Britain and France we must make like treaties in precisely the same terms with any other friendly power which calls upon us to do so," is a reflection of the ideal and of the Senate's attitude toward it; while President Taft's frank acceptance of the alternative, his refusal to be terrified by the fear of the subjunctive, and his loyalty to justice regardless of the side on which the weight of her scales may turn, is a splendid object lesson to the nations, and another great step toward the ideal which declares that just as public wrongs are considered in every civilized nation to be committed not primarily against the individual but against the commonwealth, so international wrongs must be considered as committed not primarily against the individual nation, but against the family of nations, to whom international rights and duties preeminently pertain.

—William I. Hull, The New Peace Movement, p. 79.

## INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD

To-day the significant thing is not that nineteen hundred years after the advent of a religion of peace and good will among men, gladiator nations still wet the earth with fratricidal blood; the significant thing is the constantly growing protest against it all, for that announces the birth into the modern world of a new international conscience, and that,

through an ethical necessity like that which abolished forever the bloody sacrifices of the Colosseum, means the certain and speedy abolition of war as a crass negation of human solidarity and brotherhood, and a venturous denial of a moral order of the world and the sovereignty of conscience.

—From p. 382, History as Past Ethics, by PHILIP VAN NESS MYERS; by permission of Ginn and Company, Publishers.

It has been a surprise to us to find an eagerness to listen to the discussion of at least one great international question. When we left home as one of a commission not only to represent the American Board at the centenary exercises at Bombay, but also to represent the World Peace Foundation, we supposed there would be little opportunity to interest the people of India in this peace subject. We knew China and Japan were greatly interested, and we were not surprised, therefore, to receive letters asking us to speak on world peace in these nations. But we did not realize the interest there seems to be in this subject in India. We have found letters and telegrams awaiting us from place to place, asking us to speak upon this question. These audiences have been composed of Hindus, Mohammedans, Parsee students, as well as Christian leaders. In one place the presiding officer was a leader in a wealthy social club, and the meeting was held in the clubhouse; in another he was the principal of the largest Hindu college, with 1,200 students, and one of the two leading Indians in a great city. In another case the leader was a prominent Hindu lawyer; in another a judge of the courts. The theme chosen was "International Brotherhood," and the response of the audience and the sympathetic words of those presiding indicated their deep interest. They were glad to have a business man from the United States discuss this question with them. In every case the audiences were edu-

cated men, so that we could speak to them in English, and not through an interpreter, as was necessary with other audiences of a different class.

This idea of brotherhood and that nations should find a way to live as brothers found a responsive chord. The thought that nations should give up their suspicions and jealousies and reduce their army and navy expenses seemed to be everywhere heartily approved.

—Samuel B. Capen, A letter to the Boston Herald received after his death at Shanghai, America's Opportunity and Responsibility.

The American world stands on the threshold of a new era. The magnificent undertaking which is now nearing completion, and which is destined to bring closer together many of the nations of this world, and more especially my country with your country, should find us working strenuously and enthusiastically in behalf of an All-American peace-understanding —a Pan-American *entente cordiale.* The achievement, the greatest engineering work of man, should be celebrated in a manner more enduring, more significant, than by mere shows, pageants, and expositions. By all means let us have these, but besides let us have a conclave of our world, our American world, and proclaim these to the outer world, the new Gospel of Peace on the basis of America for the Americans, the North for the North, the Central for the Central, and the South for the South. All for all and each for the other, without misgivings, without mistrust in full desire to be neighborly.

—Senor Don Federico Alfonso Pezet, Mutual Confidence and Respect as a Basis for Peace Between Nations, in the Reports of the Fourth American Peace Congress, p. 168.

## INTERNATIONAL UNION

The ideal of the future to which thought and action are painfully working their way is that of organization based upon voluntary association.

Local connection is after all an arbitrary thing. For the present, and for long enough to come, local association and cohesion must be of capital importance. But the class cohesion, which, as we have seen, bids fair to overshadow it, at all events for a time, is the symptom of revolt against its arbitrary and essentially accidental character. The explosion of the Renaissance drove the elements of population in flying drops of spray far and wide. Fresh political elements came into being to meet the changed conditions. The modern explosion, now to all appearance preparing, will have a still more startling diffusive effect in proportion as the means of travel and communication are greater. The boundaries of national feeling will be broken down, and the organization on a basis of mutual good-understanding will have begun. The organization would begin as a simple necessity. . . .

If, eventually, a complex federal polity supervenes upon this welter of castes, owing to knots of neighbors resenting the wholesale uniformity which the castes, no less than the out-worn states, would in the end impose, it will be because the inveterate habit of neighborliness is still too deeply rooted in the race to admit of an immediate further step in the direction of voluntaryism. But, with or without such an intervening period of complex federalism, it seems safe to hold that the ultimate issue will be organization on a footing of free choice.

The victory of voluntaryism would eventually come about by a process of survival of the fittest. When it is seen that a company of individuals joined together from free choice and affection have a strength that no mere fortuitous assemblage possesses, the triumph of the principle will be assured.

Such a union is that of which Ruskin spoke when, extolling the "principle of cooperation," he pointed to the handful of slime separated into its constituent parts and turning into a diamond, a ruby and an opal, set in a "star of snow."

The Voluntaryist sets each atom free to organize with its like in the way agreeable to its nature. Only so can its best qualities be brought out. Our natures are so diverse, and it is so little we can know of each other, that it can only be within the most jealously limited sphere, and with the utmost caution that any one should presume to dictate to another. Much less should a living being be set under the dominion of dead rules. Not enforced collectivism, but what Sir N. Nathan condenses in a word as the "systematization of altruism" is the hope of the coming ages.

A germ and promise of the Association-State of the far future exists in the extraordinary development of societies and leagues for all human—and some inhuman—purposes. From churches to chess clubs, voluntary societies, the entrance to which is compulsory on no one, and which rest for their existence absolutely on free enthusiasm, form a feature of modern life which in one aspect is wholly new. It is not only that they are numerous and important; the real significance of them is that they are universal. Scarcely an individual above the submerged limit who does not belong to two or three, be they only recreation clubs.

There are even now societies, which, condemn and dislike their objects as one may, have clearly transcended national limits by explicitly disclaiming national authority. It is useless to deny the attractive power of their propaganda, nor the enormous influence which those who direct it can exercise on the world. Forced union accumulates material resources: free union accumulates spiritual resources. Forced union piles up material strength, as a giant piles up flesh—but there underlie it all the giant's feeble muscle and feebler brain.

In free union the will and desire and the whole mental force of the individual are utilized to the full. The result can only be to give it an incalculable advantage. "One volunteer is worth ten pressed men."

—T. Baty, International Law, Extract from pp. 339-342.

The arbitration stage is one of very imperfect cooperation, where there is still friction, undue self-assertion, distrust, and more or less estrangement. Beyond it is a stage where love and trust shall everywhere prevail, and all the nations' good shall be each nation's rule. We have even now a prophecy of this better stage which is to be reached in the relations of nations to one another. There are already multitudes of people in our civilized society who live, in their relations to one another, on a plane entirely beyond that of arbitration. They have nothing to arbitrate or to carry to the courts of law, because they either have no differences, or settle such as they have by the exercise of their own wits tempered with a little patience and mutual forbearance. All their ordinary dealings with one another—commercial, social, religious—are in a most real sense cooperative.

—Benjamin F. Trueblood, The Federation of the World, p. 119.

The federation of the world for God and humanity, let this be the ambition, the purpose, the prayer of every patriot and of every Christian.

I am announced, I see, to speak on International Peace. It is an unpopular theme, especially with young men. I sympathize with the young men. The theme of peace has been the mother of barren platitudes which seldom lead to effective action. Peace, as usually represented, is a negative

thing. "Thou shalt not fight." Negations seldom stir enthusiasm. Men, especially young men, require something more positive to live for and, if necessary, to die for than a mere abstinence from fighting. I am not here to preach platitudes. I want to rouse you to action. No ideal ever really rouses the hearts of men to great effort that does not offer them as reward some of the privations, the sufferings, the sacrifices which, as a practical matter of fact, are summed up briefly in the word "war." If you want to enlist men for a great cause, offer them wounds, imprisonment, death—these are the magnets that attract the heroic soul—not soft feather beds, comfortable salaries, and snug pensions. Neither am I here to preach disarmament. To put disarmament before the establishment of the World-State is to put the cart before the horse. Armaments, moreover, are working out their own damnation. Nor must it be forgotten that the ruinous expenditure on armaments is a substitute for the far more ruinous expenditure on war. Nations do not test their strength by war: they have substituted for this the less bloody test of competition in preparation for war.

The great achievement that calls for your patient labor, your heroic endeavor, it may be for the sacrifice of your heart's blood, is the achievement of the unity of the world, the federation of mankind, the evolution of the Universal World-State. That ideal is so vast, although it is by no means so remote, that it can only appeal to those whose intelligence is of a comparatively high order. The very conception will appear absurd to some. It will be inconceivable to others. But to you, the *élite* of the educated youth of the world, it should appear neither ridiculous nor incomprehensible. For it is slowly being evolved, almost unconsciously, amidst us, and it may in the next few years suddenly be forced forward with a sudden leap.

—William T. Stead, To the Picked Half Million.

It is all a question of evolution and the time of day. It is growing late to take the hell way to heaven. *To-day is to-day, and we are living in to-day. War was yesterday's way.* There's a new preposition creeping into the language, or rather, an old preposition creating new prefixes—the preposition "inter." It is coming into the language because its significance is coming into consciousness as never before—intercourse, intercommunication, interdependence, interstate, international, interracial even. These words and conceptions are growing familiar, and together they mean—World-peace is coming! Apart from religion, patriotism has been deemed the noblest virtue to which appeal can be made in the case of the average man. Again and again it has lifted him high out of self. But also again and again and again it has acted to drag men down from a still higher loyalty. Let patriotism call, and the best manhood in each of two facing nations has felt it "duty" to do many things which it would lay down life *rather* than do, apart from that call. We are passing out of that stage. To-day the best manhood is beginning to understand that patriotism, to be *true* patriotism, has to be—may we not call it?—*inter-patriotism;* that to say, where other countries are involved, "My country, right or wrong," is to say, "My country, whether God will or no"; and that the God who taketh up the isles as a very little thing and counteth the nations as the small dust of the balance provides that such patriotism sooner or later brings sorrow and shame to the country beloved. Patriotism to-day demands the new prefix. All the good things and great are showing themselves inter-patriot. Science, industry, commerce, economics, literature, are all internationals. Of course ethics always has been, and must be. It follows that politics must be, for politics is only ethics applied in the making of history; and when politics learns this, war—war will become the patter of rain-drops after the departing storm.

"And thou, O my Country, from many made one,
Last born of the nations, at morning thy sun,
Arise to the place thou art given to fill,
And lead the world-triumph of peace and good-will!"

—William C. Gannett, International Good-Will as a Substitute for Armies and Navies.

**A LEAGUE OF PEACE**

Let the League of Peace be formed on the following five principles:

First. The nations of the League shall mutually agree to respect and guarantee the territory and sovereignty of each other.

Second. All questions that cannot be settled by diplomacy shall be arbitrated.

Third. The nations of the League shall provide a periodical assembly to make all rules to become law unless vetoed by a nation within a stated period.

Fourth. The nations shall disarm to the point where the combined forces of the League shall be a certain per cent higher than those of the most heavily armed nation or alliance outside of the League. Detailed rules for this pro rata disarmament shall be formulated by the Assembly.

Fifth. Any member of the League shall have the right to withdraw on due notice, or may be expelled by the unanimous vote of the others.

The advantages that a nation would gain in becoming a member of such a league are manifest. The risk of war would be eliminated within the League. Obviously the only things that are vital to a nation are its land and its independence. Since each nation in the League will have pledged itself to respect and guarantee the territory and the sovereignty of every other, a refusal to do so will logically lead to compulsion by the other members of the League or expul-

sion from the League. Thus every vital question will be automatically reserved from both war and arbitration while good faith lasts.

All other questions are of secondary importance and can readily be arbitrated.

By the establishment of a periodical assembly a method would be devised whereby the members of the League could develop their common intercourse and interests as far and as fast as they could unanimously agree upon ways and means. As any law could be vetoed by a single nation, no nation could have any fear that it would be coerced against its will by a majority vote of the other nations. By such an assembly the League might in time agree to reduce tariffs and postal rates and in a thousand other ways to promote commerce and comity among the members.

As a final safeguard against coercion by the other members of the League, each member will have the right of session on due notice. This would prevent civil war within the League. The right of expulsion by the majority will prevent one nation by its veto power indefinitely blocking all progress of the League.

—Hamilton Holt, The Way to Disarm: A Practical Proposal, pp. 8, 9.

## CHAPTER X

## THE PEACE MOVEMENT AND OTHER PEACE AGENCIES

First a thought, a wish, then a faith, next a struggle, at last a fact. So have entered into human life and history some of its profoundest truths. Such has been and is to be the story of universal peace.

### THE EDUCATION OF THE PEOPLE

Public opinion is coming to be more and more a power in the world. One of the greatest statesmen my country has produced, Thomas Jefferson—and, if it would not offend, I would say I believe him to be the greatest statesman the world has produced—said that if he had to choose between a government without newspapers and newspapers without a government, he would rather risk the newspapers without a government. You may call it an extravagant statement, and yet it presents an idea, and that idea is that public opinion is a controlling force. I am glad that the time is coming when public opinion is to be more and more powerful; glad that the time is coming when the moral sentiment of one nation will influence the action of other nations; glad that the time is coming when the world will realize that a war between two nations affects others than the two nations involved; glad that the time is coming when the world will insist that nations settle their differences by some peaceful means. If time is given for marshaling the force of public opinion, peace will be promoted. This resolution is presented, therefore, for the reason that it gives an opportunity to investigate the facts and to separate them from the question of honor; that it

gives time for the calming of passion; and that it gives a time for the formation of a controlling public sentiment.

—William J. Bryan, in Mr. Bryan's Peace Plan.

If we are going to have peace, it must be proclaimed by the common people. We shall not have peace till they understand that it is their interest as well as their duty. When that time comes, we shall have peace guaranteed so that no tyrant can move it.

—Henry Ward Beecher.

There is a consciousness that in the most important affairs of nations, in their political status, the success of their undertakings and their processes of development, there is an indefinite and almost mysterious influence exercised by the general opinion of the world regarding the nation's character and conduct. The greatest and strongest governments recognize this influence and act with reference to it. They dread the moral isolation created by general adverse opinion and the unfriendly feeling that accompanies it, and they desire general approval and the kindly feeling that goes with it.

This is quite independent of any calculation upon a physical enforcement of the opinion of others. It is difficult to say just why such opinion is of importance, because it is always difficult to analyze the action of moral forces; but it remains true and is universally recognized that the nation which has with it the moral force of the world's approval is strong, and the nation which rests under the world's condemnation is weak, however great its material power. . . .

International opinion is the consensus of individual opinion in the nations. The most certain way to promote obedience to the law of nations and to substitute the power of opinion for the power of armies and navies is, on the one hand, to foster that "decent respect for the opinions of mankind" which

found place in the great Declaration of 1776, and on the other hand, to spread among the people of every country a just appreciation of international rights and duties, and a knowledge of the principles and rules of international law to which national conduct ought to conform; so that the general opinion, whose approval or condemnation supplies the sanction for the law, may be sound and just and worthy of respect.

—Elihu Root, The Sanction of International Law, pp. 11-13, in Documents of The American Association for International Conciliation, 1907-08.

We need to secure larger resources and better organization, and take advantage of every avenue of education and influence in the great work.

First among these is the schools. Here is our greatest opportunity for impression upon the young minds, those who will soon undertake the responsibility of the world's work, the true principles that should govern international affairs. It is not possible for us to instruct the children in the innumerable class-rooms of the world on this subject; but we should be able to do much in arousing the interest of the teachers in the cause, and through them eventually the children under their care will be reached.

Our attention should be directed especially to the course of study in the schools in order that we may improve conditions there. In times past, when fighting was the main business of the world, literature consisted largely of the stories of conflicts, and much space was given to these descriptions in histories. Recent histories show a marked improvement in this respect, though there still remains too much that has a pernicious influence upon the child. Is it surprising that our children should receive the impression that war has contributed largely to the development of mankind, when so large a part of our histories and so much of the literature

studied in our schools are devoted to the details of the battlefield, dwelling so emphatically upon the picturesque features of war—the marshaling of soldiers in glittering armor, the stirring music, the brilliant charges, everything to inspire the young to wish to enter into this magnificent display? The other side of the picture should be as carefully portrayed —the return of these regiments reduced to a tenth of their original number, maimed and feeble, carrying torn and blood-stained battle-flags. The study of history should dwell largely upon the peaceful pursuits of life—agriculture, trade, commerce, schools, science. These are the things to which the children should give their chief attention, not the misfortunes resulting in the conflict of nations, which should be passed over as briefly as possible and not heralded, as in the past, giving the slightest minutiæ of the losses of men and material in conflict. That a hundred thousand men were killed upon the battlefield should be mentioned not as something praiseworthy, but as a great loss to the world.

At present for the work in the public schools of this country we have an organization, the American School Peace League, relying mainly for its executive work upon one woman, its able secretary, and deriving its chief support from another devoted woman. Two nobler women it would be hard to find; but is this what we should be content with for the greatest task this world has to perform, to see to it that the coming generation shall have adequate training upon this all-important subject? I wish to bear witness to the splendid work of organization, a work in which our foundation has been glad to cooperate, which has been done by the league in this brief period, not only in the United States, but in Europe, with the limited means as its disposal; but I plead for its generous support and the broader organization of the work. At least one third of all the money spent for peace should, in my judgment, be devoted to the schools. Our own work so far has

been more largely with the college students. This is of fundamental importance, for from our colleges come the great classes of our makers of public opinion. But we must never forget that hardly one pupil in a thousand ever reaches college and it is therefore imperative that we begin with the children at a much earlier age, and instill into them the principles which should govern them when they assume positions of responsibility in the world's work.

The preachers in the churches come into contact with all classes and conditions of men, young and old, the world over. Here is a tremendous influence that should be taken into more systematic consideration. The work of the churches should be made as constant and definite as that of the schools. I do not know what churches are for if it is not to promote the brotherhood of men. They are not, it seems to me, exerting the influence that they should in this great cause. They are not organized properly. We need strong and able men to work among the ministry from top to bottom, urging them to greater activity in this campaign of education. I welcome the present new activity to this end in the Federal Council of Churches, and we all pay high tribute to the individual pulpits which radiate such high inspiration.

The press, so powerful an influence in this educational work, may easily be made vastly more so. Editors should be urged to exercise greater care in the selection of their material and to eliminate such matter as tends to incite the people of one nation against another. Those who write for the newspapers should have a serious appreciation of their great responsibility. The press exercises a preeminent power over the destinies of mankind. We should see to it that schools of journalism are founded—we rejoice in the new enterprises in this direction—where bright young men who desire to enter this profession should be carefully educated for its duties. In every other branch of educational work the teachers and

directors serve a long apprenticeship; but in this most important vocation special training has seldom been required. This is said with the fullest and most grateful appreciation of the conscientious and effective work being done by so many of our newspapers.

—Edwin Ginn, Organizing the Peace Work.

In school and college, the growing generation must be taught that only when justice and right have inspired legislation, government, institutions and classes, has there been true progress and true prosperity. They must be taught that the great aim and purpose of man from the beginning is that of "working out the beast." Just in proportion as the individual or national life has been molded by reason and spiritual law, has a true civilization grown up. From their earliest years, men must be trained to perceive that a resort to *Force* in dealing with others is but a resort to the life of the brute creation. Heroism and patriotism—the glory of self-sacrifice for a worthy cause—is the greatest lesson for the young; but it must be heroism, unstained by bloodshed, or by the suppression of the weak by the strong. . . .

The suggestion just made is applicable still more strongly to the higher and later branches of education at the university. The great seats of learning are forming the thoughts and convictions of those who will become the world's leaders —the judges and administrators of law; the religious teachers —the thinkers; and the statesmen. Never will justice and right guide the relations of the peoples with each other, so long as the captains of industry, of science, and of government are trained chiefly to admire ideals which are wholly false.

—Hodgson Pratt, The Fraternal Union of Peoples, in Reports of the Fifth Universal Peace Congress, p. 234.

If in every university there were a group of, say, a dozen young men and women who firmly grasped the fundamental truth that the International World-State is coming into existence, and if they were to think and discuss together how best to meet this new and portentous issue, a good deal might be done to lead public opinion in the right direction. But you might ask me, What can be done? Nations, like individuals, must have some way of settling disputes. Better decision by spinning a coin in the air or drawing lots than no decision at all. Fortunately there is no necessity to refer to such a haphazard method of solving disputes. If once it is recognized that an appeal to war might mean the destruction of civilization, the Powers would sooner or later be able to agree as to the constitution of the International Supreme Court, which foundered at the last Hague Conference on the question of the selection of the judges.

—William T. Stead, To the Picked Half Million.

By our pulpits and university courses, by newspapers and magazines, every possible aid should be given toward educating the peoples of the West with reference to Eastern problems, in order that the moral sentiment of our government and people may realize in actual practice the Chinese ideal, *"Conquest by kindness is best."*

—L. H. Roots.

**Put off, put off your mail, ye kings, and beat your brands to dust—**
**A surer grasp your hand must know, your hearts a better trust;**
**Nay, bend aback the lance's point, and break the helmet bar—**
**A noise is in the morning winds, but not the noise of war!**
**Among the grassy mountain paths the glittering troops increase—**
**They come, they come!—how fair their feet—they come that publish peace.**

**—John Ruskin.**

Three large influences make for a mutual understanding

from folk to folk. The first is the newspaper, which every morning prints information from the uttermost parts of the earth. The second is travel, which teaches a multitude of people that the Chinaman, the Turk, the Zulu, and the Mexican are, after all, rather agreeable people. The third influence is the internationalization of men of learning in their world-congresses of doctors, of publicists, of engineers, of journalists, of what not, which have a mighty effect in breaking down the feeling that a man is dangerous to you because he uses strange sounds, eats out of an unaccustomed kettle, and wears his traditional costume.

One of the chief obstacles in the way of a better international understanding is the patriotic historian, who brings into the lime-light the prowess and conquests of his own race or people as against rival races.

—Albert Bushnell Hart, School Books and International Prejudices, p. 4, in Documents of The American Association for International Conciliation, 1911.

If it be true, according to the old saying, that the songs of a people are in their effect as important as the laws—and there is certainly a great truth in the saying—then we have no right to be careless about the songs which we sing and which we let our young people sing. This is peculiarly true concerning national songs and whatever affects the quality of our patriotism; for whether patriotism be a good thing or a mischievous thing depends upon its quality. That patriotism may be of a supremely mischievous character is one of the clearest and saddest lessons of the present European crisis. An exaggerated national sentiment which drowns human sentiment, and especially a patriotism identified with armies and navies and war, are responsible for many of the worst contributions to a collision for which the whole world is now

paying so awful a penalty. "Patriotism versus Christianity" was the title of one of Tolstoi's most solemn tractates; and there are few things to-day that are versus Christianity, which means universal human brotherhood, in higher degree than the false patriotism which unhappily is the most common form of patriotism. Drum and fife and gun have been the accepted symbols and instruments of our patriotism to a startling degree; and it is high time for us to realize that the teacher in the school, the preacher in the pulpit, the editor at his desk, the historian and the poet, the merchant and the workman, the policeman on his beat, and the fireman on his watch, if faithfully doing their duty, are patriots as truly as the men with guns, and with worthier tools and in higher realms of service.

—Edwin D. Mead.

**THE TEACHING OF HEROISM**

Surely Milton was right when he said, "Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war." Would you give your boy the most inspiring hero stories of to-day? Tell him the stories of Craig and Ross, who gave up their lives in Cuba that the ghastly yellow fever might be disarmed. Tell him of that young rector in New Orleans who, when the storm had again overflowed the cisterns and filled the streets with water, giving new life to the insidious mosquito, rallied his forces again under the motto, "Wear a flower in your buttonhole and a smile on your face and go to work again." Tell him of Billy Rugh of Gary, the poor crippled newsboy who gave the skin from his own limb to save the life of a young woman whom he had never known, the sweetheart of another. The sweetheart lived but the boy died. "Greater love hath no man than this, that he lay down his life for his friends." Tell your boy of the wireless operator in mid-ocean who flashes into space his S. O. S. while the ship is sinking. Tell

him of the "hello girl" at the switchboard in the upper story who sends the message that outspeeds Paul Revere—"The dam is broken, flee for your lives," while the devastating current is sweeping beneath her own feet. Tell your boy the story of Captain Scott, writing away with his frozen hand on the record of the brave triumph that overcame the dismal solitudes of the South Pole—writing and writing to his death. Tell your boy of that brave comrade of Commander Scott who said, "I am going to take a little walk," as he passed out of the tent, knowing he would never return, that the scanty supply might go the further in sustaining the remnant of that brave band in the Antarctic desolation.

—Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Peace, Not War, the School of Heroism, in The Reports of the Fourth American Congress, pp. 306, 307.

It would be a huge mistake to suppose that the pacifist teacher must be confined to the field of heroism on the grand scale. His stories need not all be, so to speak, of the Victoria Cross order. His heroines and heroes need not all be such Casabiancas, such Joan of Arcs, such Savonarolas, such Grace Darlings that the children would regard them as out of relation with ordinary life and average powers of imitation. He must assuredly honor these shining figures; but he must also find a treasury of instances in the daily round, and its encounter with accident and peril. I hasten to admit that the treasures require patient and resolute search. They do not always lie on the surface of literature or current news. Unhappily the attention of poets and narrators has been so absorbed by military episodes that they have too often missed the beauty and glory of domestic and civic courage and achievement. Nevertheless, the beauty and the glory strew the common road of life in countless profusion. In the day when the ideal of international fraternity is consecrated, our

eyes will be keener to observe, and our pens more prompt to chronicle the splendid commonplaces of the home, of industry, of mutual aid in village, in city, and the highway.

The records from which the peace teacher will draw are these:

(1) The work of women in the spheres of social service and mercy: such women as Elizabeth Fry, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Kitty Wilkinson, of Liverpool; Mrs. Chisholm, the friend of emigrant girls; Baroness von Suttner.

(2) The work of peaceful explorers—Captain Cook; Sturt in Australia; Livingstone in Africa; Nansen in the Arctic; Marianne North, who traveled the globe in quest of plants and flowers.

(3) The work of industrial pioneers, that is, in the reclamation of the sand-wastes of western France; the draining of the English fens; railway making; the laying of ocean cables; the construction and care of lighthouses; the labor of mining, fishing, tilling, ranching, and the like.

(4) The work of scientific observers and discoverers—Galileo, Newton, Darwin, Faraday, Kelvin; Edwards, the workingman geologist; Duncan, the workingman botanist; Edison; Luther Burbank; or the conquest of disease as illustrated in the careers of Lister, Pasteur, Röntgen, and Ross. As it is possible that all pacifists are not familiar with every one of these names, I may say that Burbank is a remarkable man in the United States, who has cultivated and improved a large variety of useful fruit trees; and Ross has distinguished himself in the struggle to extirpate malaria and yellow fever.

(5) Scenes from the industrial and artistic life of the many nations of the earth—the Chinaman at his silk-loom; the Hindu in the rice-field; the Japanese shaping vases, etc.; or, retrospectively, the Frenchman and Italian building cathedrals, the Germans printing the earliest printed books, etc.; and so on, in a changing panorama of the peoples,

always so presented as to attract the imagination and kindle feelings of admiration and gratitude. . . .

These typical cases may perhaps suffice. The enterprise thus indicated is not easy. It calls for patient investigation, and for the highest art of the teacher. But until the task is adequately fulfilled we must perforce allow the writer of tales of military and predatory exploits to retain the prime hold on the affections of youth.

—F. J. Gould, The Peace Movement Among the Young, Extracts from pp. 2-5, Publications of the National Peace Council.

I trust that some of you teachers who are skillful in the use of the pen will compile for the use of your pupils what I may call a Golden Treasury of Peace, a book in which will be recorded the civic acts of heroism performed by persons to whom was awarded no Victoria Cross—performed by miners, performed by doctors, performed by nurses, performed by the vast multitude of persons now nameless and obscure. I venture to think that if you teachers—for it is to you I am speaking above all—if you rest your case largely on these grounds, if you appeal to the ideal, then your results will be more practical than otherwise. It has fallen to me to study, and to some extent to teach, international law, a science which I think makes for peace; for what, after all, is international law but the carrying into the relations of nations the rules of justice? Well, I would venture to make two or three reflections drawn from that science, and the first is this. It has often been the aspiration and desire of men in the past to form some great community which would be more comprehensive than any nation. This was the dream of men such as Dante or Leibnitz, and a great number of thinkers and far-seeing men. Well, that dream is rapidly coming true. They were a little before their time, but they

saw what was coming; and slowly but certainly there is arising not merely a conception, but the reality, of a structure wider than any nation, more comprehensive than any nation, a community in which every lover of peace is a citizen.

—Sir John Macdonell, Teachers and International Peace, in Publications of the National Peace Council, Extract from p. 3.

We are, of course, going to better the present order of things. The new teaching of history will help rapidly in this —in which in the last thirty years the old military monotony has yielded so signally to the varied and illuminating synthesis of the nation's political, religious, literary, scientific, and industrial life. Each of these realms, the young people and their elders come to see, has had its heroes, as heroic as any upon the Plains of Abraham or Bunker Hill or Lookout Mountain; and the heroes will not wait long for celebration. At the Old South Meetinghouse in Boston, a few years ago, one of our lecture courses for young people was devoted to "Heroes of Peace," and these were the heroes and heroisms honored, each by a lecture: "John Eliot, the Apostle to the Indians"; "Horace Mann and His Work for Better Schools"; "Mary Lyon and Her College for Girls"; "Elihu Burritt, the Learned Blacksmith"; "Peter Cooper, the Generous Giver"; "Dorothea Dix and Her Errands of Mercy"; "General Armstrong and the Hampton Institute"; "Colonel Waring, and How He Made New York Clean." The best thing about it was that the boys and girls, who do have a hunger and rightful claim for the chivalric and the stirring, but who are greatly wronged in the ascription to them of an absorbing love for blood and thunder, were, on the whole, more deeply interested in these heroes than in those of the War for Independence or the War for the Union, who never lack full justice from our hands at the Old South. . . .

I was returning to London from Surrey wanderings, in the course of which by interesting coincidence we had visited the country home and the grave of Watts, the painter, on the hillside close by the pretty little village of Compton, when on the train my eye caught a column in the day's London newspaper headed "Workaday Heroes." This was the opening paragraph of the impressive article:

If ever you need to remember that the age of chivalry is not yet dead, you should take a 'bus to the General Post Office. The building, is, indeed, rather sedate than heroic, and the atmosphere unencouraging to roving fancy; but if you take your life in your hand and cross the road to Saint Botolph's, you find birds chattering about grass and tree, a scrap of country in the swiftest whirl of the town, to make a vestibule for a simple shrine of noble deeds. One of the most English of modern poets has sung the honor "of lives obscurely great." He who would understand the spirit of England must go, not only to the temple of famous men at Westminster, but to the little red-roofed cloister in the Postmen's Park. In its midst, beneath the inscription "The Utmost for the Highest," stands a statuette of a bearded man with lofty brow, grave, long-robed; and below is written: "In Memoriam, George Frederick Watts, who, desiring to honor heroic self-sacrifice, placed these records here." There is space upon the walls for nearly a hundred and fifty tablets. Until last week only twenty-four places had been filled. The care of Mrs. Watts has now added another row of twenty-two, and the names to fill two more tablets have been chosen. The first jubilee of Queen Victoria was the occasion of Mr. Watts's suggesting a national memorial to the men and women who have lost their lives in saving life. He caused long researches to be made into the vast masses of newspapers in the British Museum, that such deeds might not linger in obscurity. A national memorial still remains nothing more than the noble idea of a great artist, but a modest part of his conception Mr. Watts himself made actual. He built in that "Postmen's Park" by Saint Botolph's, which covers the site of the burial grounds of Saint Botolph's itself, Christ Church, and Saint Leonard's, the simple cloister, with its dark bench and beams, floor of brick, and roof of tile, where the deeds of Londoners are enshrined. The first

**twenty-four tablets, many of which were in position before the painter's death, are of glazed white, bearing their simple inscriptions in dark blue letters. It would be hard to find material more pleasing in its effect or better adapted to withstand the ravages of the London atmosphere. The first act recorded is of the year 1863, the last of 1901.**

One tablet honors the heroism of a player in a pantomime at the Princess's Theater. The clothes of one of the actresses caught fire, and this other, Sarah Smith, ran to her to put out the flames, and succeeded, but was herself so terribly burned that in a day, after much suffering, she died. There are the names of Walter Peart and Henry Dean, driver and fireman of a Windsor express on which the connecting rod of the engine broke and tore the boiler asunder. In a deluge of flame and steam they stuck to their posts and stopped the train, saved their passengers, and met a terrible death. There is the tablet to Mary Rogers, the stewardess of the Channel Islands steamer *Stella,* which went down in 1899. When the last boat was pushing off, the sailors bade her jump in, but she answered, "No, no; if I get in the boat, it will sink. Goodby! Goodby!" She lifted her hands then, and cried, "Lord, save me!" And the *Stella* sank beneath her feet. There is the tablet to Alice Ayres, the maidservant in Southwark, who saved all her master's children from a fire at the cost of her own life. . . . There are the names of two doctors who sacrificed their lives for their patients. There is the name of Solomon Galaman, the little East End boy of eleven, who saved his tiny brother from being run over in the crowded market street and fell himself beneath the wheels. "Mother," he said, as he lay dying, "mother, I saved him, but I could not save myself." The story of many another is equally heroic. . . . It is a veritable book of the ever-growing Bible, another book of Acts—the acts of a fortunately monumented few whose names have been snatched almost by chance from

among those of the unmonumented thousands who, through the generations, in their humble places, cheered by no trumpet and no hope of pension, have had the fibrous faith that made them faithful unto death, saving others because they would not save themselves.

—Edwin D. Mead, Heroes of Peace, Extracts from pp. 6-9.

While the boy must learn that no progress in civilization is made without struggle, he must learn also that this struggle need not involve slaughter or injury to any one; struggle against indolence, ignorance, ill health, and the forces of nature is quite sufficient to develop brawn and bravery. The pupil will learn that, while war was inevitable before the advent of agriculture, when men subsisted on a limited amount of game, ever since abundance of food has been made possible war has become less excusable. Our admiration of heroes who fought in the old days when war had much excuse must not blind us to the fact that that time is now passed. Cooperation must be emphasized as the only key to normal human progress.

—Lucia Ames Mead, Patriotism and the New Internationalism, Extract from p. 48.

**THE TEACHING OF HISTORY**

What about our schools—not simply the colleges and universities, but all the schools—which offer fertile ground to sow the seeds of peace? Thus far in the history of our schools too much emphasis has been laid upon military history, etc. Dates and events of national wars have been thoroughly drilled into students, and the glory and blaze of war brought out. We have actually made it a glory and a virtue. One of the most encouraging signs of the times, however, is the fact that many of our text-books are dropping out the prolonged study of wars and centering more on the peaceful pur-

suits of the nation and the commercial relations with foreign powers. How about direct peace teaching in the lower schools? How much of it do we include in the work? None at all. Many are the speakers who address the schools on war reminiscences, but few indeed are the appeals made for peace. Not until this movement is strongly emphasized in our schools from the very beginning can we hope completely to drive out the war spirit; for time is required to develop in the individual conscience a full realization of the real nature of war, and such development should begin with the plastic period of youth.

—Victor Morris, Man's Moral Nature the Hope of Universal Peace, in Prize Orations, pp. 154, 155.

We begin in a wrong way with our children. Boys are taught to play at soldiering, to admire generals as the greatest heroes, and instead of being made sick with the horrors and savagery of war, they are led to regard the soldier's life as noble and glorious, an altogether desirable career. The history we give them is made up of war stories, while the heroes and achievements of commerce and literature, of art and science, of morals and religion, are assigned a secondary place.

—John Clifford, The War and the Churches.

One of the ablest teachers of history in the United States and an authority on historical matters, Professor H. Morse Stephens, Oxford graduate, and professor of history at the University of California, in speaking not long since to a group of history teachers (myself included) said: "History has not been properly taught until quite recently, and the wrong teaching of history accounts for much of the warlike attitude among the nations of Europe."

—Robert C. Root, The Mills of Industry on the Trail of Mars, in the Reports of the Fourth American Congress, p. 515.

What is the use of trying to teach little children to dislike a nation which includes millions of little children, because three or four generations ago there was war between the two countries? The groundwork of American intellectual and political life is and will always remain English. The true principle in writing text-books ought to be to dwell upon our glorious heritage of all of England down to the Revolution, and much since that time. Shakespeare is our dramatist; Elizabeth was our queen; Tennyson is our poet; Dickens is our novelist. We ought to recognize the fact that the English have been working out a magnificent system of popular government on their own lines; that king, lords, and bishops do not interfere with a government subject to public opinion; that of all the nations of the world Great Britain is that one which is nearest to the United States in kinship, in institutions, and in inspirations.

—Albert Bushnell Hart, School Books and International Prejudices, p. 13, in Documents of the American Association for International Conciliation, 1911.

A nation's annals should embrace more than the crimes of its kings and the rebellions of its aspiring nobles; and if they must include instances of manslaying, it should be in order to reprobate instead of glorifying them, to turn the manslayer into the villain instead of the hero of the human tragedy. After four centuries it should now be possible to emulate Erasmus, that prince of humanists, who, when instituting a course of instruction in Christian principles, set aside the panegyrists of Achilles and Cæsar—whom he described as mere "raging brigands"—reserving them for very special uses, remarking that such histories might be injurious in the highest degree. The "heroes" must now be plainly described as anachronisms—in plain language, "back num-

bers" in the story of human progress. History must be rewritten from the standpoint of humanity. The prejudices which lead to admiration of bloody deeds must be extirpated. Teachers, mothers, and all those who make first impressions on childhood, must impress hate of war, and a sense of the value and dignity of human nature and life. In proportion as history is written from the religious and humanitarian standpoint, instead of the pagan and patriotic one, it will become a record of the growth of humanity in the arts of peace; and it will be the aim of such writers to trace the approach of nations to their moral ideals through every stage of advance, reaction, frustration, and renewal.

—Walter Walsh, The Moral Damage of War, Extracts from pp. 90, 91.

**THE INTERCOLLEGIATE PEACE ASSOCIATION**

Even the most sanguine of workers for international cooperation must have been pleasantly surprised when, a little over a year ago, the Foundation for Internationalism at The Hague, in a singularly interesting volume on "Scientific Internationalism—Pure Sciences and Letters," acquainted us with the names, officers, forms of organization, and brief historical sketch of six hundred and fourteen international organizations and institutions in the scholastic world, all of them embracing at least a pair of nations, many holding periodic world congresses, and not a few maintaining an official organ of their own. These organizations and institutions embrace every field of scholastic endeavor—from literature to geodesy, from theology to scientific photography, from history to technology.

All the larger colleges and universities in the United States, and more than half of the total number of such institutions, maintain courses of instruction that stimulate interest in international relations and tend to develop what has been

happily termed "the international mind." Such are especially the courses offered for the study of colonization and expansion of empire, of Asiatic and African problems, of international law and diplomatic history. All of these studies focus attention upon the movements toward world-organization during the last twenty years. They contribute directly to the formation of a more intelligent public opinion concerning human fraternity and the increasing solidarity and unity of all social interests. They therefore help to make our student body ripe, as it undoubtedly is, for the doctrine that international disputes must and can be settled by pacific rather than violent means.

The strength of such sentiments among our colleges is shown in the rapid development of such an organization as the Intercollegiate Peace Association. The representatives of eight colleges, responding to the initiative of President Noah E. Byers of Goshen College and Professor Elbert Russell of Earlham College, both of Indiana, organized the Association in a conference at Goshen College in June, 1905. Its purpose was defined as "the promotion of organized activities among students and educators in support of the international arbitration and peace movement." It established prize contests among students for orations upon those subjects, and in connection with its third annual conference at Cincinnati, in 1907, it held the first interstate oratorical competition in which representatives of colleges in two States took part. Since then the Association has grown until now it includes colleges in sixteen States, and has been obliged to divide into three groups, the Eastern, Central, and Western. The interstate competitions are followed by a final national contest at the Lake Mohonk Conference in May of each year. In 1912 about eighty colleges participated in the State contests, about two thousand dollars were awarded in prizes, and more than three hundred orations on peace were written and delivered

by as many undergraduates. The effect of such activities and discussions upon the student body is far-reaching. The first secretary of the Association, Mr. George Fulk, carried its influence into the international field in a most striking manner, offering at the second Hague Conference in 1907 a memorial representing over 22,000 students and over 1,600 teachers. —Louis P. Lochner, Internationalism Among Universities.

**THE COSMOPOLITAN CLUBS**

There is a movement among the students of the United States which furnishes to the world a striking illustration of the possibility of men from different countries living together —often even under the same roof—in friendship and harmony; a movement which unites in a league of world-brotherhood students of every race, color, and creed; a movement in which the terms dependent and independent races are unknown, but which assumes all races and peoples to be on a footing of equality. This movement is of recent development, and had its origin in the change of complexion of the American student body by virtue of the fact that thousands of Orientals, Latin-Americans, and Europeans are now thronging our halls of learning, where formerly the foreigner was an almost unknown quantity in an American university. By way of illustration, let me cite the fact that at the University of Wisconsin, which I have the honor to represent, the number of foreign students has within ten years increased from seven to one hundred and seven—a condition which is typical of every large American university. . . .

A National Association of Cosmopolitan Clubs was founded in 1907, which has a membership of over two thousand and includes representatives from almost sixty different countries. A monthly organ, *The Cosmopolitan Student,* keeps the members in touch with each other and with the various movements

for the better organization of the world. At a convention held at The Hague, Holland, in August, 1909, an affiliation was even perfected with the Féderation Internationale des Étudiants, better known as Corda Fratres. Our work is thus on an international basis, and the possibilities for effective cooperation unlimited. United the two bodies have become a league of universal brotherhood which will soon encompass the student body of the whole civilized world.

Hawaiian and Frenchman, Japanese and American, Chinese, German, Hungarian, Filipino, and Armenian, all are on a footing of equality in this unique organization. What matters it that one is an engineer, another a law student, a third an agriculturist? That one believes in monarchical government, while the other sees in the control of the masses the only solution of the social problem? That one is a Japanese prince, the second a Russian revolutionist, the third a plain American farmer boy, the fourth a Hindu priest? Why despise a man because his skin is yellow or brown or black? The members of the international and cosmopolitan clubs need no unity or color, race, or social position to bind them together. Theirs is a firmer tie. "Above all Nations is Humanity," is the proud motto of our Association. Humanity —all-embracing, all-including, linked with the idea of brotherly love, of sympathetic understanding, of service to mankind—this is a bond of union far transcending national, social, and racial lines of demarcation.

The purpose of the international and cosmopolitan clubs is to bring together college young men from different countries, to aid and direct foreign students coming to the United States, to cultivate the arts of peace, and to establish strong international friendships.

—Louis P. Lochner, The Cosmopolitan Club Movement in the Papers on Inter-Racial Problems, pp. 439, 440.

### THE CHRISTIAN STUDENTS' FEDERATION

A mighty international force among the colleges and universities of the world is the Christian Students' Federation (Fédération Universelle des Étudiants Chrétiens). The American leader and General Secretary of this international organization, Mr. John R. Mott, is a living embodiment of the international spirit. In the course of twenty-five years he has made himself at home in forty-four countries, and he wields a globe-encircling influence.

In the Federation, now comprising 2,305 Associations with 156,071 members, nineteen different local federations are included. They reach into every continent. The biennial conferences of the Federation are held first in one hemisphere and then in the other. At the 1911 conference, at Constantinople, twenty-eight countries were represented. This is nothing less than a parliament of the world, and every member of this Federation cannot help realizing that the brotherhood of man is a vital fact.

—Louis P. Lochner, Internationalism Among Universities.

### THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT

In order to give a just idea of the movement which is impelling humanity toward a closer understanding and more peaceful accord, it would be necessary to consider both the work done by intergovernmental activity and that due to private enterprise. Although they are intimately connected, however, I have found it necessary to restrict this account to the field of free international institutions, a large and complex field, of which two figures will enable the reader to appreciate the extent. From 1843, when the first international congress was held on private initiative, until 1910 there were more than two thousand international meetings, of which eight hundred fall in the last decade. The total

number of central offices of all kinds having for their object the study of questions of general human interest from a universal point of view already amounts to more than two hundred and fifty.

—Henri La Fontaine, The Work Done by Private Initiative in the Organization of the World, in Papers on Inter-Racial Problems, p. 244.

The religious conception of peace as a moral demand, though in its use by religious teachers it has had a very fluctuating history, has nevertheless since the time of Christ led the whole historic development of the peace movement. It has been a sort of headmaster to the movement, giving to it now and then impulse, inspiration and direction, and stirring the natural peace forces into stronger and more effective activity. It is only as the religious and the natural phases of the movement are both taken into account that the historic development of the principle and practice of peace can be properly understood.

The idea of peace as a matter of moral obligation and the practical application of pacific methods in social and international affairs have developed at about the same rate. The growth and extension of the idea can therefore be fairly well traced in terms of its practical application in conciliation, mediation, arbitration, and the evolution of law and order in society.

The idea of universal and perpetual peace, which has taken such a wide and deep hold upon the thought of recent times, was unknown to the ancient world. The controlling principle among all the ancient peoples as to peace and war was that of family or race. Within a patriarchal group, a tribe, or collection of tribes within a common race, the idea of peace as useful and even obligatory was usually considerably developed. This is the case now among the unchristianized

peoples of the world. Tribes which fight like fiends with one another manage, in spite of their ignorance, unrestraint, and animalism, to keep up within themselves a fair amount of friendship and pacific life and cooperation.

The forces which operated among the ancient peoples in producing this measure of pacific life were sense of kinship, contiguity of dwelling, interdependence, and some realized community of interest. Beyond this sphere of race or family war, pillage, conquest, enslavement, were considered not only permissible but also obligatory. Often the obligations of peace were felt only within very narrow limits, the tendency being, until Christianity began to operate, to reduce the feeling of obligation to the minimum of family relationship rather than to expand it to the limits of racial kinship.

The religions of the ancient peoples, growing as they did largely out of the characters of the peoples and their environments, deepened and strengthened these conceptions. The national gods were looked upon as protecting and favoring the home people, but as hostile to all others. . . .

The same principle of race governed the Jewish people in the matter of peace and war. The peace for which their psalmist and prophets sighed was peace upon Israel, the peace of Jerusalem, not the peace of the world, of nation with nation. War against heathen peoples was considered not only lawful but obligatory. Love of other peoples and rational treatment of them was scarcely dreamed of among the Hebrews. Love of neighbor was as far as they got, and their theory of this was much better than their practice. In their conception of God, in regard to some of His attributes, they rose, or were lifted, vastly higher than any other nation of their time. Their God, the one true and living God, was the Creator of all nations and peoples, as well as of the heavens and of the earth. But it is curious that this conception of God never led them to see and feel the real kinship and one-

ness of humanity, as one might expect it would have done. They drew from it rather the selfish notion of great superiority over other peoples. They believed that this God, their God, meant them to bring all other nations under their sway, and that the Messiah whom he was to send would do this service for them. Not even their greatest prophets were able wholly to divest themselves of the racial narrowness of view. They now and then, as in the case of Isaiah, Micah, Ezekiel, Zechariah, had glimpses of the larger peace of the world, but its true nature and method of attainment they failed to grasp. . . .

The nearest approach to modern peace conceptions, outside of two or three of the Jewish prophets and rabbis, was found among the Greek philosophers and poets. There was something of this nature in both Confucius and Buddha, but it is doubtful if the "universal benevolence" of the one or the "fraternity of humanity" of the other went beyond the great races to which they belonged. Their teachings certainly had no social effect in the relations of these peoples to others. . . .

In general, in the ancient world, the use of pacific methods of settling disputes was as limited as the idea of peace. In the case of Rome it was purely internal and political. Rome never arbitrated with other nations, or acted as arbitrator for them. . . .

The principle of kinship, though lying at the basis of the whole pacific development of human society, was not naturally strong enough to accomplish much anywhere until it was elevated, purified, and strengthened by the revelation of the fact that it is not of merely earthly origin, but is rooted in the divine Fatherhood in which alone the oneness of humanity finds its rational explanation.

The true and complete conception of peace, both as to its motives and its scope, was given to the world for the first time by Jesus Christ and his early followers. Such doctrines

of God as the Father and of men everywhere as brothers and neighbors were taught by them, and naturally broke down among the Christians, after a little time, racial distinctions and international barriers. Perhaps *practiced* would be a better word than *taught*. Love of God and of fellow-men was their life. Jesus himself gave the idea of peace in its deepest and fullest sense. But He did more; He made it intensely vital by His life of self-sacrificing love. His teaching came out of His life. The inspiration of His example, of His life and death, was worth a thousand Sermons-on-the-Mount, unsurpassed as the mountain instruction was. The Sermon on the Mount does not seem to have been much used in the earliest Christian days, though after the New Testament books were written and collected it had a large place. In the earliest period it was entirely overshadowed by the Teacher himself. It was the inspiration of His personality, of His living example, the transfusing of His personal spirit into them, that made the early Christians, for a hundred years and more, the enthusiastic exemplars of a fraternity which knew neither class nor race nor national boundaries. . . .

The seventeenth century brought to the world the first unfolding of the idea of international peace in a large and comprehensive way. Unlike the Christian movement of the first and second centuries, this evolution of the seventeenth century was not only religious and social but also juridical and political. Four events of the seventeenth century, occurring in four different countries, the outcome of the thinking and work of four eminent men, have been the talk of much of the civilized world ever since, and may be considered the four corner stones of the structure of modern peace. . . .

The first of them was the Great Design of Henry IV. of France, in the early years of the century, for the federation and peace of Christian Europe. The greatest in the line of

French kings, Henry seems to have combined in his person the extraordinary contradictions of his time. A Protestant and a Catholic, rich and powerful, yet simple in manners and devoted to the interests of the common people, a warrior and a genuine friend of the peaceful arts of life, a Frenchman to the core, he was nevertheless the first interpreter to his country of the larger ideal of international life and the cooperation then struggling to the birth. His Great Design was favorably received at more than one court in Europe. . . .

In 1625, fifteen years after the death of Henry IV., Hugo Grotius, whose patron the French king had been, published his famous book, "On the Rights of War and of Peace." This was the second of the four events. All his immense learning and his acquaintance with European affairs, gained through exile and diplomatic service, Grotius threw into an effort to lessen the cruelties and sufferings inflicted by war. He denounced in unmeasured terms the facility with which professedly Christian princes went to war, declaring their conduct to be a disgrace even to barbarians. He pleaded in a noble Christian spirit for the use of arbitration. His book immediately had an immense effect in Europe. . . .

Grotius's work was the foundation of international law, which has developed greatly since his time, and has gradually been carrying the ideas of justice, respect, and mutual service into international affairs.

The third of the seventeenth century events to which I allude was the peace work of George Fox. Fox was born the year before Grotius published his book, and began his ministry twenty-three years later. The English peacemaker went much farther than the great Dutchman. He revived the early Christian position, feebly uttered before his time by the Mennonites and Moravians, that the spirit and teaching of Jesus leave no place whatever for war and the spirit out of which it springs. He incorporated this teaching as a

fundamental in the doctrinal constitution of the Society of Friends. He uttered this principle with such marvelous energy, moral thoroughness, constancy, and suffering endurance that the whole English-speaking world was compelled to listen. No small part of Europe also heard his voice. Nor has the utterance ever been forgotten. Its maintenance in an organized way by the Friends has kept the high ideal of absolute and universal peace constantly before the eye of civilization as a guiding light. . . .

The fourth of the seventeenth century events alluded to was William Penn's Holy Experiment in government on peace principles, inaugurated on this side of the Atlantic in 1682. With this must be coupled his Plan for the Peace of Europe, published eleven years later in England, a scheme free from the destructive contradictions of the Great Design of Henry IV. Penn's experiment in practical peace politics, the first of its kind in history, lasting more than half a century, has become almost an inherent part of the moral consciousness of the modern political world, and it is becoming every year more effective in creating a belief that war is always honorably avoidable if men sincerely wish it to be avoided. . . .

The movement of thought and purpose which these men of the seventeenth century interpreted with such insight and courage went steadily on into the eighteenth century. It found a number of distinguished representatives in different fields. . . .

The last years of this century gave us Kant's great tractate on "Perpetual Peace," in which was uttered for the first time the idea of a federation of the world in an international state built upon republican principles; and Kant's thought was vigorously sustained and developed by his followers, Fichte and Schelling.

For the most part the peace work of the eighteenth century was still theoretical and ideal. There was little attempt at the

practical. The time had hardly come for it in any general way. Opinion was still too feeble and unintegrated. The Friends as a body continued their peace protest, but in a very traditional way, and many of them failed in the hour of testing. . . .

The eighteenth century, in spite of Saint Pierre, Bentham, and Kant, and the growing undercurrent of thought and aspiration represented by them, closed with Napoleon overshadowing Europe and war still on the throne.

It is a noteworthy historic fact, deserving mention in connection with the opening of the nineteenth century, that the movement for the abolition of war and that for human liberty went hand in hand. . . . The liberty movement of the last two centuries, resulting in independent republics in the New World and constitutional governments in the Old, has seen the peace propaganda spring up and develop simultaneously and almost coterminously with it. The nation which has taken the lead in the development of liberty and the creation of institutions founded thereon has also led in the movement for the abolition of war, on both its sentimental and its practical side.

The nineteenth century saw a remarkable evolution of the movement for peace along many lines. The movement not only became much more extended, but it also became thoroughly organized and strongly practical. It did not, however, lose any of its idealism. It deepened and widened on its sentimental side quite as much as on its practical side. For every peace idealist whose name comes to us from the two previous centuries, the nineteenth furnishes scores. Noah Worcester, William Ladd, Jonathan Dymond, William E. Channing, Charles Sumner, Elihu Burritt, William Jay, John Bright, Richard Cobden, Henry Richard, Hodgson Pratt, Victor Hugo, Charles Lemonnier, Frederic Passy, Bertha von Suttner, Leo Tolstoy, John de Bloch, and Nicholas II., to

mention no others, all were primarily peace idealists. Some of them were nothing else, and were none the less useful for that reason. But the strong idealism which characterized the century's peace efforts, did not prevent them from being singularly practical. In recent years the labors of the friends of peace, both in their individual and their organized capacity as societies and congresses, have consisted largely in efforts to secure the adoption of pacific methods of settling disputes. . . . In Kant's day statesmen were so far from giving peace any place in their thought that he delicately apologized to them in his "Perpetual Peace" for venturing to suggest that his treatise might not do them any damage. To-day, only a little over a hundred years from his time, the largest peace organization in existence, the Interparliamentary Union, with thirty-six hundred members, consists wholly of statesmen, who meet annually or biennially in European and American cities to promote the settlement of international differences by arbitration.

—Benjamin F. Trueblood, Historical Outline of the Peace Movement, American Peace Society Publications.

The memorable action of the International Congress of Chambers of Commerce in Boston, in September, 1914, showed impressively how deeply the business men of America and of the world feel the present system to be opposed to all the true interests of commerce and economy and to the whole spirit of our present international civilization. The workingmen's organizations throughout the world are pronouncedly anti-militarist, the great Social Democratic parties of Germany and other European countries, made up so largely of workingmen, being so earnest and active for peace that more than once in recent times their demonstrations in critical exigencies have had a clear and perhaps determining influence

on governments. The farmers of the country are with us, as expressed by the repeated declarations by the National Grange, representing a million of them, in its conventions. The National Federation of Women's Clubs, with its million women, has just officially made the peace cause its cause, and it speaks for the overwhelming majority of the women of the land. The National Education Association has unanimously indorsed the principles and efforts of the American School Peace League, affiliating that League as an integral part of itself, and also recognizing the peace cause as the cause of the schools of America. The broad new activities of the Federal Council of Churches through its strong Department of Peace, witnessing as they do to the larger and distincter devotion of all the churches of the country to the peace movement, add emphasis to the fact that the Christian religion and all religions mean nothing if they do not mean the reign of justice and reason and brotherhood among men. In the presence of these profound and assuring movements of the national mind and conscience, shall our politics alone take counsel of fear and not of faith—or will our statesmen lead the nation in the high service for the family of nations which is the commanding duty of the time?

—Edwin D. Mead, The American Peace Party and Its Present Aims and Duties.

During the last ten years the women of America and of the world have been rapidly advancing to the very front rank of service and influence in the peace movement; and at its biennial convention at San Francisco in 1912, the National Federation of Women's Clubs, whose membership includes a million American women, made the peace cause one of its regular interests, creating a special standing committee for its promotion in all the clubs of the country. By eloquent coincidence, the Federation was addressed at that convention

by the Baroness von Suttner, the distinguished Austrian peace advocate, author of "Lay Down Your Arms," which has been called the "Uncle Tom's Cabin" of the peace movement, who was then on her last visit to this country. The Baroness von Suttner's death, on the very eve of the terrible war in Europe, gives new and solemn emphasis to her American addresses, and especially to her addresses to American women. Upon the eve of her return to Europe she wrote the following words in her Foreword to Mrs. Mead's "Swords and Ploughshares":

"While I came to America at this time to speak to all classes which it was in my power to reach upon the peace cause which lies so close to my heart, it was my central aim and wish to appeal to the women of America, who are far better organized than their sisters in Europe, and whose central organization has this year for the first time made the definite and persistent study of our cause and devotion to this cause a regular feature of its remarkable and most beneficent work. What may not these millions of thoughtful and earnest American women accomplish for the world! It was the English Ruskin who said that whenever the women of the world really make up their minds to put a period to war, they can do it. It is for the women of America, now in the fullness of time and the urgency of need, to do the great work which it is in their power to do for the peace and order of the world."

It was hardly five years after the close of the Civil War that the terrible Franco-Prussian War broke out; and while it was still in progress Julia Ward Howe tells us that she was visited by a sudden feeling of the cruel and unnecessary character of the contest. "It seemed to me," she wrote, "a return to barbarism, the issue being one that might easily have been settled without bloodshed. The question forced itself upon me, Why do not the mothers of mankind interfere

in these matters, to prevent the waste of that human life of which they alone bear and know the cost? I had never thought of this before. The august dignity of motherhood and its terrible responsibility now appeared to me in a new aspect, and I could think of no better way of expressing my sense of these than that of sending forth an appeal to womanhood throughout the world." She immediately drew up such an appeal, imploring women the world over to awake to their sacred rights and duties to protect human life from the frightful ravages of war. She called upon those women in whose hearts her appeal found response to assist her in calling and holding a congress of women in London, to organize a holy crusade of women against the war system. She had the appeal translated into French, Spanish, Italian, German, and Swedish, and distributed copies of it far and wide, devoting two years almost entirely to correspondence upon the subject with the leading women in various countries.

She held two meetings in New York, at which the cause of peace and the ability of women to promote it were earnestly presented. To the first of these meetings, in the late autumn of 1870, Mr. Bryant came and spoke; and at the second, David Dudley Field, the great advocate of international arbitration, made a powerful address. In the spring of the year 1872, Mrs. Howe went to England to work personally for the holding of a woman's peace congress in London. In Liverpool she was welcomed by Mrs. Josephine Butler, who told her that she had come at a fortunate moment, as the public mind was at the time greatly stirred by the cruel immoralities of army life, and who gave her the names of the Winkworths and other friends of peace in London who would welcome and help her. William Ellery Channing was at the time in London, and she had much aid and counsel from him in her "Woman's Apostolate of Peace," as she afterward named it.

Impressively in her letter of 1907 does she emphasize the

fact that it was her consuming desire to unite the women of the world in opposition to the war system, which had been the mainspring of her devotion to the higher education of women and the spread of women's clubs. Rejoicing over the great achievements of the generation she exclaimed, "The noble army of women which I saw as in a dream, and to which I made my appeal, has now come into being"; and to this noble army she made her new appeal for decisive service in the last great campaign in the war against war. "If we have rocked the cradle, have soothed the slumber of mankind, let us be on hand at this great awakening, to make steadfast the peace of the world." Nothing could have given her supremer satisfaction than the action of the National Federation of Women's Clubs at San Francisco in 1912.

It is well for us in this hour, in the time which is now ripe for the great peace crusade of women for which the world of 1872 was not ready, to remember again, more gratefully and more seriously, her solemn "Appeal to Womanhood Throughout the World." With growing confidence as the years went on she repeated her prophetic appeal; and it is now for the women of America, whom she believed at last equal to the task, to obey the call and fulfill the prophecy.

—Edwin D. Mead, Woman and War.

John Bright, with his forty years of experience in the British Parliament and in public life, a thorough outspoken apostle of peace principles, fearless, able, and consistent in his support of the cause in every vicissitude of his political fortunes, is considered historically the greatest and most conspicuous advocate in political life who has voiced those principles. His life work in upholding the cause of peace before the whole world at its commercial center, himself long a prominent member of the government of the most powerful nation in the world, his noble moral character, each and all

contributed to extend his ceaseless influence world wide. He has settled forever, both in Parliament and in public meetings all over the kingdom, that peace principles can be effectively presented and agitated with great success. He has shown that, under the influence of a venal and warlike press, a senseless delirium for war may be created, which subsides after cruel slaughter and havoc, and this is followed by sober reason, repentance and sorrow; that there have been no wars for centuries which in the end have been by wise and pure men regarded as necessary or useful to mankind. John Bright and his coadjutors did more to advance the peace cause than had been done for centuries in all lands before their time.

—Augustine Jones, Peace Principles in Political Life and Institutions, in the Reports of The American Friends' Peace Conference, p. 129.

1915 will mark the centenary of the founding of the first Peace Society the world ever saw. When the New York merchant David Low Dodge established this first Peace Society he made membership in a Christian church a prerequisite to membership in his society; and the peace movement in America and England has been essentially a Christian movement ever since, though naturally, except at the beginning, it has made no such condition of membership. Almost invariably the Hebrews the world over are counted among the friends of peace, and on the continent of Europe the ablest of the free-thinkers are often found to be ardent pacifists. Following the leadership of David Low Dodge, the noble ancestor of illustrious descendants, and in the same year, the Massachusetts Peace Society was started in Boston by Noah Worcester and William Ellery Channing. In these days of international courts and conferences which seem to novices to have sprung up full-fledged in the last fifteen years, it is well for students to turn back to the heroes and pioneers

who in New England thought out the methods of world organization and international justice before the present actors in the world's great drama were born. They died before they saw the fruition of their toil and tears and hopes; but the statesmen who met at The Hague Conference in 1899 owed their success largely to these men, who had in the thirties and forties marked out what came to be known in Europe as the "American plan." William Ladd, whose work indeed deserves a monument, must in this brief survey be passed with no adequate word of eulogy. Charles Sumner was as valiant a champion of peace as he was of the abolition of slavery. . . .

Elihu Burritt, "the learned blacksmith," a marvelous self-made scholar with the heart of a child, brought about cheap ocean postage and, working untiringly both at home and in Europe, shared with his great contemporaries, Cobden, Bright, Richard, Victor Hugo, in the great task of stirring the nations still suffering from Napoleon's exhausting wars. . . .

To Elihu Burritt more than to any other was due the success of the great International Peace Congresses in Europe in the middle of the last century.

—Lucia Ames Mead, Swords and Ploughshares, pp. 10-12.

The American Peace Society held its first meeting and adopted its constitution in New York City on the 8th of May, 1828, seventy-nine years ago. It moved its headquarters to Hartford, Conn., in 1835, where it stopped until 1837. It then transferred its work to Boston, where it remained until 1911 when it removed to Washington.

The Society grew out of the movement which had begun as far back as 1809, and had culminated in 1815 in the organizations of the first peace societies.

The first tract put forth in this country for the cause of peace was written in 1809 by David L. Dodge, a merchant

of New York City, grandfather of the late William E. Dodge. The title of the tract was "The Mediator's Kingdom not of this world." It was in Mr. Dodge's parlor that the New York Peace Society, the first in the world, was organized in August, 1815, though the proposition to form one had been put forth by him in 1812. David L. Dodge is therefore rightly entitled to be called "The Father of the Modern Peace Movement." . . .

The Ohio Peace Society and the Massachusetts Society were organized the same year. These societies were soon followed by others. The whole Atlantic seaboard section of the country, then a large part of the nation, seemed moved throughout, as by a common impulse, with the conviction that the moment had come for a serious united effort to abolish war and to establish among the nations in its place a system of rational pacific adjustment of controversies. A similar movement in Great Britain originating about the same time ran parallel with the American movement. . . . Back of the origin of the American Peace Society lay thirteen years of difficult pioneer work, led by David L. Dodge, Noah Worcester, William E. Channing, William Ladd, Josiah Quincy, Samuel J. May, Henry Holcombe, and others. . . .

The founder of the American Peace Society—the man who saw most clearly the ripeness of the time and felt the necessity of bringing into cooperation all the scattered forces that had begun to work for the peace of the world—was William Ladd. . . . The first suggestion of a national peace society, a union of those already operating, was made by him in 1826, in the society of Minot, Me., which he had founded.

—Published by The American Peace Society.

The first international peace congress was initiated at the headquarters of the American Peace Society in Boston during

the month of July, 1841, and held in London in 1843, with an attendance of about three hundred delegates. Five years later Elihu Burritt was able to bring together a second and more representative peace congress in Brussels. The following year, and through Burritt's influence, there was organized a third congress in Paris, presided over by Victor Hugo, with over 2,000 delegates in attendance. In 1850 Burritt successfully promoted a fourth international peace congress in Frankfort, and in 1851 a fifth, which was held in London. It is to the credit of his time that Elihu Burritt was recognized as the man of vision, prophet, and seer. . . .

The Interparliamentary Union, with a membership of 3,600 parliamentarians, representing twenty-two nations, including China, Russia, and Turkey, was first mooted by Messrs. Fischoff and Richard in 1875. Plans for its organization were halted by the Russo-Turkish war, but through the influence of William Randal Cremer, a preliminary meeting of parliamentarians from Great Britain and France was held in Paris in the autumn of 1888. In June, 1889, the organization was perfected at Paris. . . .

The first resolution passed by any government in favor of the principle of arbitration was pushed through the House of Commons in 1873 by Henry Richard, who for forty years was secretary of the London Peace Society and who for over twenty years was a member of the English Parliament. In the last half dozen years nearly one hundred obligatory arbitration treaties, providing that certain questions must and others may be settled by arbitration, have been passed by various nations of the world. The United States has been a party to over a score of these. . . . Since 1875 the number of international meetings has increased greatly. There are to-day approximately five hundred international organizations. During the year 1912 there were approximately one hundred and thirty international conferences. And more

impressive, perhaps, than any of these international conferences already mentioned have been the Geneva Tribunal, which settled the Alabama claims in 1872; the Paris Tribunal, which settled the seals controversy in 1893, and the Hague Tribunal, which settled the North Atlantic Coast Fisheries dispute with Great Britain, lasting through three generations, in 1910. . . .

The American Peace Society, founded by William Ladd in 1828, has headquarters at Washington, is an incorporated organization, with five equipped "Departments" in our United States, twenty-eight "Constituent Branch" societies, five "Section" societies, two "Auxiliary" branches, and six other "Cooperating" societies. This society initiates the American peace congresses, attempts to cooperate with the government, and to influence legislation in behalf of arbitrations and international good will. It maintains a lecture bureau, a library of peace information, and distributes tons of literature to writers, speakers, schools, colleges, and libraries. It is organizing new peace societies as speedily as possible; and it issues *The Advocate of Peace* monthly. It cooperates in every possible way with such effective organizations as the International Peace Bureau at Berne, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Associations for International Conciliation, the World Peace Foundation, the Corda Fratres, and the Mohonk Conferences.

—Arthur Deerin Call, The Doom of War, Extracts from pp. 14-18.

## A UNION OF THE PEACE PRESS

Two years ago I put forward the proposal to establish an "International Union of the Peace Press," which would have the aim of making the Press gradually helpful to the cause of peace and mutual understanding.

My chief idea was that there are already in various countries a fairly large number of persons and journals which do their best to promote this mutual understanding:

*These elements, already numerous, but scattered, must first be united, and formed into an organization which will have the name of the "International Union of the Peace Press." The pacific writers who already exist in various countries will thus be organized.*

The establishment of such a Union will be a great advantage in itself. *It will have an influence by the very fact that it exists.* It will show that there is a body of men, scattered over the world, who are working through the Press for peace. It will bring to general knowledge *the contrast of the respectable and the mischievous Press,* and so have a greater influence on the public than the isolated writers would have.

Such an organization, which could easily be established, will:

(1) Become a center of crystallization, gradually attracting the best elements out of the Press on the other side.

(2) At once make its influence felt on the Press, raising its tone, and so become immediately an important factor in the attainment of peace. . . .

We must not overlook the sympathetic disposition we may rely on finding in governments as well as peoples. We may see that governments often use the Press as a trumpet, and, directly, or indirectly, foster the cry of war; but we must not forget that the warlike and inflammatory attitude of a section of the Press is often very much disliked by statesmen, who are more and more disposed publicly to condemn such tactics. It is true that all statesmen are not sufficiently honorable to cry, with Winston Churchill: "God preserve us from our patriotic Press!" or, like the late English Minister of Public Works, Harcourt, to stigmatize a certain class of

publicists as "the pickpockets of politics and enemies of the human race."

—Alfred H. Fried, The Press as an Instrument of Peace, in the Papers on Inter-Racial Problems, pp. 423, 424.

## LITERATURE OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT

In discussing for the general American public the literature of the peace movement, and in commending to students the best books to read, there is really no better place to begin than with the considerations and the books which the honored Bishop of Hereford, the ablest and most influential champion of the cause among English churchmen, commends to his English friends. It would be hard to name two books devoted to the peace cause, which state the general case better than Sumner's "Addresses on War" and Channing's "Discourses on War," the two American volumes which the Bishop of Hereford refers to most conspicuously. Sumner's addresses especially, although the most of them were given more than half a century ago, remain to-day the most powerful impeachment of the war system, the most persuasive plea for international justice, and the most impressive history of the peace movement, which we have in equally brief compass.

Channing's "Discourses on War" represent the highest position which has been taken by the American pulpit in this great crusade, and there is nothing which the ministers and members of Christian churches can more profitably read as declaring the right attitude of religious men concerning peace and war. They were the first noteworthy discourses upon the subject in our pulpit; and they have a further historical interest in the fact that it was in Channing's study in Boston, in the Christmas week of 1815, that the Massachusetts Peace Society was organized, Channing standing side by side with

Noah Worcester in the organization in its early years. One of the addresses included in the Channing volume published in the International Library is the tribute to the memory of Worcester. All of the discourses are informed by the clear and resolute thinking, moral fervor, and definite application of conscience to public affairs which inspired Channing's utterances in every field of social and religious life. . . .

One can never forget such sermons as those of Theodore Parker, such essays as Bushnell's on "The Growth of Law," or such addresses as that by Reuen Thomas (published by the American Peace Society) upon "The War System in the Light of Civilization and Religion." The Nestor of the peace cause in America in this latest time was our revered preacher Edward Everett Hale, and the students of the peace movement must not neglect his writings and general advice in behalf of arbitration and the better organization of the world. I think it was he who first said that the time was near when a nation which had a Secretary of War and no Secretary of Peace would not be considered fit for civilized society; and I think that it was his church which first organized a department of international justice as one of its regular instrumentalities. If I were to name the man in the American pulpit to-day who seems to me the Channing of the movement with us, it would be Charles E. Jefferson of the Broadway Tabernacle in New York. The learning, penetration, sharp exposure of fallacy, prophetic statesmanship, and religious uplift of his pulpit utterances and published papers upon peace and war during the last half dozen years have been noteworthy indeed. . . .

Dodge's "War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ" has been recently republished, with a biographical introduction, in the International Library; and Worcester's famous old pamphlet of 1814, "A Solemn Review of the Custom of War," which had an immense circulation and

exerted a profound influence in its day, may be obtained for a few cents from the American Peace Society.

These two famous works by Dodge and Worcester are the early classics of the peace movement in America; and while Dodge's work is old-fashioned in its style and method, and both works lack that emphasis upon international organization which we find a little later in William Ladd, and which finally created the Hague Conferences, it is surprising how modern they are in much, and how complete their impeachment still remains of the folly, waste, and wickedness of the war system. The most powerful recent impeachment of the system upon these grounds is Rev. Walter Walsh's "Moral Damage of War," an impassioned but also most detailed and definite work, first called out in Great Britain by the Boer War, but as salutary and necessary for Americans as for Englishmen to read. A passionate exposure of the war system of a quite different character, but equally impressive, is the famous story, "Lay Down Your Arms," by the Baroness von Suttner.

—Edwin D. Mead, The Literature of the Peace Movement.

## CHAPTER XI

# THE SOCIALIZING OF CHRISTIANITY; THE SPIRIT OF CHRIST PERMEATING THE NATIONS

Deeper than all law is national character, of which law is but one expression. —Charles R. Henderson.

### THE INFLUENCE OF THE PEOPLE

Modern civilization began, not so much when printing was invented, as when its full power became felt in the general education of the common people; not so much when feudalism gave way to absolute monarchy as when absolute monarchy was replaced by constitutional government; not so much when church reform began in Europe as when universal principles of right in all religions began to be recognized the world over; not so much when gunpowder began to displace the spear and shield as when the higher forces of justice and public opinion began to displace gunpowder and make laws for nations.

Constitutional government is simply a sign of public sentiment. That is its vital breath. It is the sentiment of a particular people. But let many peoples show that sentiment, each for itself, and sooner or later there naturally follows a general sentiment of all peoples that, as all governments rest on the consent of the people and exist to promote the good of the people, so the relations between different peoples should

be so ordered as to promote the general good of each of them, and of each of them alike.

Kant, in the eighteenth century, declared that there could be no universal peace until every nation had adopted republican institutions. That was the first condition. It must come to remove one great cause for war—the promotion of individual or dynastic interests. So long as one absolute monarchy existed, and existed in a nation content to endure it, no neighboring nation could feel secure without ready means of self-protection.

We of the twentieth century hardly yet realize that the condition which Kant demanded has now been fulfilled. Every civilized power has to a greater or less extent adopted republican institutions; Russia, Turkey, China, Persia, even little Montenegro, have one after another identified themselves with the spirit of a new age. Constitutional government has become the accepted form. The world has begun to feel and act as a unit. History is no longer to be provincial. Europe and European settlements are not the only social forces to be considered when the historian forecasts the future or measures the past. Men feel themselves, as never before, citizens of the world.

—Simeon E. Baldwin, The New Era of International Courts, in Judicial Settlement of International Disputes, p. 14.

The world only grows better because people wish that it should, and take the right steps to make it better. Evolution is not a force but a process; not a cause but a law.

—William E. Channing.

Mr. T. Baty, the writer on international law, has said: Printing and the locomotive have enormously reduced the

importance of locality. It is the mental atmosphere of its fellows, and not of its neighborhood, which the child of the younger generation is beginning to breathe. Whether he reads the *Revue des Deux Mondes* or *Tit-Bits,* the modern citizen is becoming at once cosmopolitan and class-centered. Let the process work for a few more years; we shall see the common interests of cosmopolitan classes revealing themselves as far more potent factors than the shadowy common interests of the subjects of States. The Argentine merchant and the British capitalist alike regard the Trades Union as a possible enemy—whether British or Argentine matters to them less than nothing. The Hamburg docker and his brother of London do not put national interests before the primary claims of caste. International class feeling is a reality, and not even a nebulous reality; the nebula has developed centers of condensation. When it is once recognized that the real interests of modern people are not national, but social, the results may be surprising.

As Mr. Baty points out, this tendency, which he calls "stratification," extends to all classes:

It is impossible to ignore the significance of the International Congresses, not only of Socialism, but of pacifism, of Esperantism, of feminism, of every kind of art and science that so conspicuously set the seal upon the holiday season. Nationality as a limiting force is breaking down before cosmopolitanism. In directing its forces into an international channel, Socialism will have no difficulty whatever. . . . We are, therefore, confronted with a coming condition of affairs in which the force of nationality will be distinctly inferior to the force of class-cohesion, and in which classes will be internationally organized so as to wield their force with effect. The prospect induces some curious reflections.

—Norman Angell, The Great Illusion, Extracts from pp. 291-329. (G. P. Putnam's Sons, Publishers.)

Peace is a fundamental necessity for social reform.
—Hon. Lady Barlow.

The real hindrance to every reform movement and philanthropic undertaking lies not in the ignorance or viciousness of the people, but in the active and intelligent opposition of those who derive profit from wrong or inhumanity.
—Walter Rauschenbusch.

The truth is, the democracy, with its doctrine of equality, belongs in the realm of ideal things, or, to put it very plainly, of religion. If we did not believe that this is a Divine universe; if we had no faith in the ideal justice and in the supreme life of God to whom all belong; if we had not the aspirations and hopes that especially belong to religion; if we were reduced to the conception of a mere physical, material world—we should neither have any rational ground to advocate our American democracy, nor any heart to be willing to live and die for it. Democracy and religion march together to victory, or else they must go to the land of dreams.

The true democracy is not here now. It is the government that ought to be. It is the ideal state, where no longer each shall ask, when he votes, What is my own selfish interest? but each shall honestly vote for the welfare of all. The ideal is of a multitude of friendly men, not merely eager, as now, to obtain their individual rights, but in earnest also to perform their fair share of duties. The democracy presupposes men of manly stature and character; it educates men. It could not have been in an era of barbarism, egotism, greed, selfishness. It did not begin to be possible till at least some men of the order of the idealists, the men of humanity and religion, appeared.

The time-honored prayer says, "Thy kingdom come." This

does not mean that any one to-day expects a miraculous arrangement of human society, ushered in by angels. It means rather that we have the vision of a society which we are set here to bring about. We are spelling out the laws which will effect this as fast as they are obeyed. When we repeat the words of the prayer, we speak our purpose to make the ideal thing real.

—Charles F. Dole, The Coming People,
Extract from pp. 132-134.

Notwithstanding all present opposition, the United States will not fail. She will heed the summons to the lofty mission of peace. The blare of the bugles and the beating of the drum will give way to the song of the angels; and the brotherhood of man, which means peace between the nations, will find its loftiest expression in the unfoldings of our history. There are three great forces in our civilization, each of which, more potent here than elsewhere in the world, voices for international peace; and government of and by the people will heed those voices.

First, the business interests. Nowhere are there more varied and larger business enterprises carried on than in the United States. Our merchants sweep the entire horizon of the world in their pursuit of business. Our manufacturing industries, some of them gigantic in extent, search the whole realm of industry in the furtherance of their work. The inventor and the mechanical engineer are ever busy devising new methods of toil, new machines, for accomplishing more and better work. Over one million patents for new and useful inventions have been issued from the Patent Office at Washington. The means of locomotion and the facilities for communication are extending in every direction. We have more miles of railroad than any other nation in the world and almost as many as all other nations put together.

Mountains are no barrier; rivers do not stay their course. Now all these interests look askance at the prospect of war. They dread the destruction of property and business. They hate to see the efforts of the brainy turned away from the furtherance of these interests into devising additional means of killing and sowing the land with the seeds of destruction. When Mr. Carnegie said that if any controversy arose between Great Britain and the United States it could be intrusted to the merchants of London and New York, who would settle it peacefully and with honor to both nations, he expressed the longing and faith of all business interests and may be looked upon as seer and prophet.

Second, the laborers. The great mass of the American people are toilers, and their votes determine the policy of the government, for it is a government of and by the people. In England the labor party pressed upon the government the consideration of a limitation of armament, and the government, obedient thereto, dared not withhold presenting the matter to the second Hague Conference. Mr. Keir Hardie, the leader of that party in Parliament, in an address in this country declared that the laborers of the world were all opposed to war and demanded that all difficulties between nations should be settled by arbitration. The toilers see that war means the waste and destruction of property. They know that it takes life, that the army is drawn from their numbers, and that their homes are drained to fill the cemeteries of the battlefield. They also realize full well that the cost of armies and of war is enormous, that that cost is made good by taxes, and they are beginning to appreciate more and more the fact that they pay the bulk of the taxes. They see the great nations of the Old World piling up from year to year and from decade to decade an ever-increasing burden of debt, and they also perceive that this country, which during thirty years had paid off two thirds of the debt created

by the Civil War, has since then for military armament and naval display not only ceased to reduce, but has practically ceased all efforts at reduction. They are weighing the earnest words of Secretary Root when, appealing to the South American states for a closer union, he declared:

"Let us pledge ourselves to aid one another in the full performance of the duty to humanity which that accepted declaration implies, so that in time the weakest and most unfortunate of our republics may come to march with equal step by the side of the stronger and more fortunate. Let us help one another to show that for all the races of men the liberty for which we have fought and labored is the twin sister of justice and peace. Let us unite in creating and maintaining and making effective an all-American public opinion, whose power shall influence international conduct and prevent international wrong, and narrow the causes of war, and forever preserve our free lands from the burdens of such armaments as are massed behind the frontiers of Europe, and bring us ever nearer to the perfection of ordered liberty. So shall come security and prosperity, production and trade, wealth, learning, the arts, and happiness for all."

Third, woman. I am not now speaking as champion or prophet of female suffrage. I note only the fact that the last half century has changed her position. She is no longer a purely home body, but has entered largely into public life. Whether voting or not, she has become an active and vigorous force in the national life. Her patriotism is as certain and as strong as that of her brother, and whenever the need comes, although she may not shoulder the musket or draw the sword, she does all that is possible to ameliorate the hardships of war. The Red Cross is her work and her glory, and the noble bands of women who are giving their time and strength to increasing its efficiency and extending the reach of its influence are among the heroines of the nation. But while all

this is true, you need no assurance that her voice is and always will be potent for peace. No mother nurses her baby boy and rears him to manhood without dread that his life may in its prime be cut off by the merciless bullet. She looks forward to old age in the hope and faith that that boy, in the vigor and strength of manhood, will be her comfort, support, and glory. There never was a time since the beginning of days that woman longed for bloodshed or the carnage of war, and the more fully she realizes its waste and destruction the more earnest will become her opposition.

These are three great forces in the life of this nation; and as they unite in the effort for arbitration and international peace, they will compel the public men of the day to heed their demands.

I believe in the promises of Scripture, that His word shall not return unto Him void, but shall accomplish that which He pleases and shall prosper in the thing whereto He hath sent it; that the time will come when the swords shall be beaten into plowshares and the spears into pruning hooks, and when men shall learn war no more forever.

With the eye of faith I see unrolled on the canvas of the future a glorious picture, in which shall be seen every laborer dwelling beneath his own vine and fig tree, receiving ever a living wage for his toil, every merchant and manufacturer pursuing his business and his industry without a thought of interruption by the ravages of war, and men of science and wealth combining in the achievement of more and more gigantic results, adding not merely to the necessities, but also to the comforts and luxuries of life, taking possession of land and water and air, and all the forces to be found in them, and making them minister to human life. In the foreground will be seen that highest type of womanhood, the Madonna, and across her bosom will be these words: "Mary hath kept all these things, and hath pondered them in her heart";

while underneath will shine in letters of fadeless light, "The United States of America has fulfilled its mission."

—Justice David J. Brewer, The Mission of the United States in the Cause of Peace.

Whenever the women of the world really make up their minds to put a period to war, they can do it.

—John Ruskin.

The law has grown by development through the influence of the opinion of society guided by its skilled advisers. But the law forms only a small part of the system of rules by which the conduct of the citizens of a state is regulated. Law, properly so called, whether civil or criminal, means essentially those rules of conduct which are expressly and publicly laid down by the sovereign will of the state, and are enforced by the sanction of compulsion. Law, however, imports something more than this. As I have always remarked, its full significance cannot be understood apart from the history and spirit of the nation whose law it is. Moreover it has a real relation to the obligations even of conscience, as well as to something else which I shall presently refer to as the General Will of Society. . . .

Besides the rules and sanctions which belong to law and legality, there are other rules, with a different kind of sanction, which also influence conduct. I have spoken of conscience, and conscience, in the strict sense of the word, has its own court. But the tribunal of conscience is a private one, and its jurisdiction is limited to the individual whose conscience it is. The moral rules enjoined by the private conscience may be the very highest of all. But they are enforced only by an inward and private tribunal. . . .

The field of daily conduct is covered, in the case of the citizen, only to a small extent by law and legality on the one

hand, and by the dictates of the individual conscience on the other. There is a more extensive system of guidance which regulates conduct and which differs from both in its character and sanction. It applies, like law, to all members of a society alike, without distinction of persons. It resembles the morality of conscience in that it is enforced by no legal compulsion. In the English language we have no name for it, and that is unfortunate, for the lack of a distinctive name has occasioned confusion both of thought and of expression. German writers have, however, marked out the system to which I refer and have given it the name of "Sittlichkeit." . . .

"Sitte" is the German for custom, and "Sittlichkeit" implies custom and a habit of mind and action. It also implies a little more. Fichte defines it in words which are worth quoting, and which I will put into English: "What, to begin with," he says, "does 'Sitte' signify, and in what sense do we use the word? It means for us, and means in every accurate reference we make to it, those principles of conduct which regulate people in their relations to each other, and which have become matter of habit and second nature at the stage of culture reached, and of which, therefore, we are not explicitly conscious." . . .

The system of ethical habit in a community is of a dominating character, for the decision and influence of the whole community is embodied in that social habit. Because such conduct is systematic and covers the whole field of society, the individual will is closely related by it to the will and spirit of the community. And out of this relation arises the power of adequately controlling the conduct of the individual. If this power fails or becomes weak the community degenerates and may fall to pieces. Different nations excel in their "Sittlichkeit" in different fashions. The spirit of the community and its ideals may vary greatly. There may

be a low level of "Sittlichkeit" and we have the spectacle of nations which have even degenerated in this respect. It may possibly conflict with law and morality, as in the case of the duel. But when its level is high in a nation we admire the system, for we see it not only guiding a people and binding them together for national effort, but affording the greatest freedom of thought and action for those who in daily life habitually act in harmony with the General Will. . . .

The development of many of our social institutions, of our hospitals, of our universities, and of other establishments of the kind, shows the extent to which it reaches and is powerful. But it has yet higher forms in which it approaches very nearly to the level of the obligation of conscience, although it is distinct from that form of obligation. I will try to make clear what I mean by illustrations. A man may be impelled to action of a high order by his sense of unity with the society to which he belongs, action of which, from the civic standpoint, all approve. What he does in such a case is natural to him, and is done without thought of reward or punishment; but it has reference to standards of conduct set up by society and accepted just because society has set them up. There is a poem by the late Sir Alfred Lyall which exemplifies the high level that may be reached in such conduct. The poem is called *Theology in Extremis,* and it describes the feelings of an Englishman who has been taken prisoner by Mahometan rebels in the Indian Mutiny. He is face to face with a cruel death. They offer him his life if he will repeat something from the Koran. If he complies, no one is likely ever to hear of it, and he will be free to return to England and to the woman he loves. Moreover, and here is the real point, he is not a believer in Christianity, so that it is no question of denying his Saviour. What ought he to do? Deliverance is easy, and relief and advantage would be un-

speakably great. But he does not really hesitate, and every shadow of doubt disappears when he hears his fellow-prisoner, a half-caste, pattering eagerly the words demanded. He himself has no hope of heaven and he loves life—

> **"Yet for the honor of English race**
> **May I not live or endure disgrace."**

I will take another example, this time from the literature of ancient Greece.

In one of the shortest but not least impressive of his *Dialogues,* the "Crito," Plato tells us of the character of Socrates, not as a philosopher, but as a good citizen. He has been unjustly condemned by the Athenians as an enemy to the good of the state. Crito comes to him in prison to persuade him to escape. He urges on him many arguments, his duty to his children included. But Socrates refuses. He chooses to follow, not what anyone in the crowd might do, but the example which the ideal citizen might set. It would be a breach of his duty to fly from the judgment duly passed in the Athens to which he belongs, even though he thinks the decrees should have been different. For it is the decree of the established justice of his City State. He will not "play truant." . . .

Why do men of this stamp act so, it may be when leading the battle line, it may be at critical moments of quite other kinds? It is, I think, because they are more than mere individuals. Individual they are, but completely real, even as individual, only in their relation to organic and social wholes in which they are members, such as the family, the city, the state. There is in every truly organized community a Common Will which is willed by those who compose that community, and who in so willing are more than isolated men and women. It is not, indeed, as unrelated atoms that they have lived. They have grown, from the receptive days of

childhood up to maturity, in an atmosphere of example and general custom, and their lives have widened out from one little world to other and higher worlds, so that, through occupying successive stations in life, they more and more come to make their own the life of the social whole in which they move and have their being. They cannot mark off or define their own individualities without reference to the individualities of others. And so they unconsciously find themselves as in truth pulse-beats of the whole system. It is real to them and they in it. They are real only because they are social. The notion that the individual is the highest form of reality, and that the relationship of individuals is one of mere contract, the notion of Hobbes and of Bentham and of Austin, turns out to be quite inadequate. . . .

In willing the General Will we not only realize our true selves but we may rise above our ordinary habit of mind. We may reach heights which we could not reach, or which at all events most of us could not reach, in isolation. There are few observers who have not been impressed with the wonderful unity and concentration of purpose which an entire nation may display—above all, in a period of crisis. We see it in time of war, when a nation is fighting for its life or for a great cause. We have seen it in Japan, and we have seen it still more recently among the peoples of the Balkan Peninsula. We have marveled at the illustrations with which the story abounds of the General Will rising to heights of which but few of the individual citizens in whom it is embodied have ever before been conscious even in their dreams. . . .

Thus we find within the single state the evidence of a sanction which is less than legal but more than merely moral, and which is sufficient, in the vast majority of the events of daily life, to secure observance of general standards of conduct without any question of resort to force. If this is so

within a nation, can it be so as between nations? That brings me at once to my third point. Can nations form a group or community among themselves within which a habit of looking to common ideals may grow up sufficiently strong to develop a General Will, and to make the binding power of these ideals a reliable sanction for their obligations to each other?

There is, I think, nothing in the real nature of nationality that precludes such a possibility. A famous student of history has bequeathed to us a definition of nationality which is worth attention; I refer to Ernst Renan, of whom George Meredith once said to me, while the great French critic was still living, that there was more in his head than in any other head in Europe. Renan tells us that, "Man is enslaved neither by his race, nor by his language, nor by his religion, nor by the course of rivers, nor by the direction of mountain ranges. A great aggregation of men, sane of mind and warm of heart, creates a moral consciousness which is called a nation." Another acute critic of life, Matthew Arnold, citing one still greater than himself, draws what is in effect a deduction from the same proposition. "Let us," he says, "conceive of the whole group of civilized nations as being, for intellectual and spiritual purposes, one great confederation, bound to a joint action and working toward a common result; a confederation whose members have a due knowledge both of the past, out of which they all proceed, and of each other. This was the ideal of Goethe, and it is an ideal which will impose itself upon the thoughts of our modern societies more and more."

But while I admire the faith of Renan and Arnold and Goethe in what they all three believed to be the future of humanity, there is a long road yet to be traveled before what they hoped for can be fully accomplished. Grotius concludes his great book on War and Peace with a noble prayer: "May

God write," he said, "these lessons—He who alone can—on the hearts of all those who have affairs of Christendom in their hands. And may He give to those persons a mind fitted to understand and to respect rights, human and divine, and lead them to recollect always that the ministration committed to them is no less than this, that they are the Governors of Man, a creature most dear to God."

—Viscount Haldane, Higher Nationality, Extracts from pp. 12-14, in Documents of The American Association for International Conciliation, 1913.

## THE SOCIAL LIFE OF THE NATIONS

The test of national greatness in the past has always been the capacity to make all other nations bring tribute. That has been the greatest nation which could take the most from other nations, which could steal the most, conquer the most, destroy the most men or cities, subdue other nations under her feet. . . .

But all this has changed. The great men of to-day are not the Napoleons but the Pasteurs. We honor the men who save life—not those who destroy it. The great man is not he who *gets* the most, but he who *gives* the most. We determine a man's genius even, not by his ability to acquire a vast fortune, but by his ability to use it where it will most forward human evolution. The great man to-day is he who renders most service to humanity; who considers himself steward of whatever trusts God may have given him; who, in his greatness befriends the weak and helpless; whose heart is set on duties rather than on rights.

The question is whether this is not to be the test of a nation's greatness in the twentieth century. Is not that nation to be greatest which can forget its self-interest occasionally and go out; which can be the friend and helper of

the weaker nations; which can demand that justice be done in the world; which can have the sense of *mission,* of being sent to seek not its own only, but to bless others; which can learn that it is giving which makes a nation great, as it is giving and serving which makes men noble? There are already signs of a tendency to bring nations up to the same test as that which we now apply to men. . . .

But how is it with our own country? Is she leading in this regard? Is she "going out" more than any other nation, to befriend and bless—to serve and develop other lands? Is she learning to put aside that national greed and stealing, which, until very recently, even our churches have praised and blessed, and even sink her own rights for the sake of lifting other nations up and securing welfare for them? Perhaps this is to be the ultimate test of national greatness in the twentieth century as it is already the final test of human nobleness. Let us be glad that we can say, up to the present time, that the United States has led in this high test of greatness. . . .

Think of it! The President of the United States declaring to the world that this nation does not intend to steal any one's land and that her chief duty is *to help those nations that cannot help themselves!* Who ever heard of such a thing of a nation before! Of a man, yes—of all gentlemen. It is what makes men great. But of a nation, no. Yet we believe that the accomplishment of President Taft's high ideal is to be the nation's future claim for greatness. We believe that he echoed the thought of the people and we are glad. This country is on the way to greatness as thus she goes out to her sister republics.

—Frederick Lynch, What Makes a Nation Great, Extracts from pp. 79-85.

We have seen that the happy life is the social life. The

fullness and joy of life depend upon the largeness of the flow of the circulation of active good-will between a man and his fellows; it follows that there is an endless process of adjustment between the members of each little society—a family, a neighborhood, a club, a labor union—with a pressing urgency upon, and within, each individual so to relate himself to all the others as to make this circulation free in every direction. Whenever misunderstanding or selfishness impedes the flow, discontent (or dis-ease) appears. Whenever the adjustment is true, happiness prevails.

Now, this same deep law holds in the larger relations of men, as they form groups or states or nations, with innumerable contacts upon one another. No group can long be happy or largely successful alone, unless the other groups are flourishing. . . . All states are linked together; all races meet; all religions stand out in the open for comparison. The happiness of each nation, its prosperity, the success of its institutions, is bound up with the welfare, the prosperity, the quality of the government, and the civilization of every other nation. One law holds us all. The life of the whole world consists of the flow of the active and intelligent good-will of each and all peoples, penetrating into every relation of their business and their mutual intercourse. Where distinct "classes" exist with jealousy and pride between them, or when neighboring peoples quarrel (and all peoples are now neighbors), the welfare of every little child, whether in Oregon or London, is menaced. A flame set anywhere in this modern world may grow to a conflagration. A strike in Australia is at once a tax upon the labor of all men. We have seen a war of little Balkan nations cause an increase of unemployment upon the streets of New York. Every seeming success or fortune, built out of justice or even out of the failure to render a social equivalent in service, is already in unstable equilibrium. . . . The world is finding out, and

publishing, another rather surprising discovery. We have long been hypnotized to suppose that armies and navies exist for the protection of the people who have to furnish the soldiers and to pay the immense taxes required by the military system. We had supposed that our neighbors were our enemies. We are learning that the other nations are just like ourselves. They have no real reason to hate us, as we have none to hate them. They may be as shy of us as we are shy of them, but they do not wish to attack us or do us any harm. They like to be friends with us and to trade with us, as we enjoy thinking of them as our friends. Only the few in any nation are responsible for the existence of suspicion or enmity. They are mostly those who belong to the military profession, or who have guns and ships to build. To stir up suspicion seems to be a matter of business with them. They publish alarms about the dangers of war, which they themselves invent and manufacture. My point is, that generally the masses of the population of the great nations of the world are all the time coming nearer to a common sympathy, to a mutual understanding, to a freedom from race prejudice, to a sense of the gigantic oppression which the war system compels us all to suffer. We are learning that our common enemies, namely, ignorance, arrogance, selfishness, greed of gain, which in every age have created militarism and afforded excuses for war, exist in every land, and are here at home as well as abroad. Is it not immense gain to see that the people over the seas have the same enemies that we have? Out of these common enemies conquest, tyranny, and oppression have come. . . . Does the question seem to some difficult, how a world order among the nations can be maintained and defended, and how backward peoples in Africa or the Balkan peninsula can be made to live together? Will there be a great central world-executive with a powerful force at his command to punish disorderly or disobedient nations? And

will not such an armed central authority endanger the costly liberties of the world? So argue those that follow the doctrine that "government rests at last upon force," who go on thinking that it must always be so. Why must it always be so, if men cease to be brutes? The new lesson is plainly in sight, that government can be strong only when it is a vast scheme of cooperation resting upon the good will of its people. How many men to-day obey the laws because they fear the sheriff, and not, rather, because they recognize the nature of law which, like "the rule of the road," is meant for the common welfare?

—Charles F. Dole, The Coming People, Extracts from pp. 210-223.

What is the relation of international law to social duties? International law is in its essence an effort to define the conduct most conducive to common welfare in the relations of peoples in peace and war; it is one chapter in the system of thought about social duties. International law seeks to protect the integrity of nations, the right of each nation to its own government and to its own way of managing its affairs, so long as it does not trespass on others. It seeks to protect the peaceful control of its property and territory by each state. It defines the rights and duties of foreigners while they are residing or traveling among foreign peoples. It provides for diplomatic correspondence by means of ministers, ambassadors, consuls, as agents of states. It provides for contracts and agreements in the form of treaties.

It sounds almost like mockery to speak of rules for war, that is rules for murder and slaughter, and yet even a moderation of carnage is a gain, perhaps a movement toward the abolition of such bloodshed. Woolsey tells us that the principles of a humane and yet efficient war-code are especially

these: that war is a way of obtaining justice when other means have failed; that it is waged between governments; that quiet inhabitants of a country are to be treated with humanity and with as little severity as will allow of the effective prosecution of the conflict; that as soon as justice can be secured, armed contest ought to cease; and that retaliation, if necessary on account of the inhuman or deceitful conduct of the adversary, cannot go to the extreme of justifying that which is morally wrong. . . .

Elihu Root has said: "International opinion is the consensus of individual opinion in the nations. The most certain way to promote obedience to the law of nations and to substitute the power of opinion for the power of armies and navies is, on the one hand, to foster that 'decent respect for the opinions of mankind' which found place in the great Declaration of 1776, and, on the other hand, to spread among the people of every country a just appreciation of international rights and duties, and a knowledge of the principles and rules of international law to which national conduct ought to conform; so that the general opinion, whose approval or condemnation supplies the sanction for the law, may be sound and just and worthy of respect.

"There is no civilized country now which is not sensitive to this general opinion, none that is willing to subject itself to the discredit of standing brutally on its power to deny to other countries the benefit of recognized rules of right conduct. The deference shown to this international public opinion is in due proportion to a nation's greatness and advance in civilization. The nearest approach to defiances will be found among the most isolated and least civilized of countries, whose ignorance of the world prevents the effect of the world's opinion; and in every country internal disorder, oppression, poverty, and indebtedness mark the penalties which warn mankind that the laws established by civilization for the guid-

ance of national conduct cannot be ignored with impunity." . . .

Deeper than all law is national character of which law is but one expression.

Our best protection against wrong is our own righteousness, fairness, kindness to all men in all relations. The most powerful means of overcoming evil is goodness. To conquer the heart of a man or a nation is the only enduring conquest. To be secure in universal good will is the most impregnable fortress. Let us quote the words of a soldier and statesman, Carl Schurz:

"The old Roman poet tells us that it is sweet and glorious to die for one's country. It is noble, indeed. But, to die on the battlefield is not the highest achievement of heroism. To live for a good cause, honestly, earnestly, unselfishly, laboriously, is at least as noble and heroic as to die for it, and usually far more difficult. I am confident our strongest, most effective, most trustworthy, and infinitely the cheapest coast defense will consist in 'Fort Justice,' 'Fort Good Sense,' 'Fort Self-respect,' 'Fort Good-will,' and if international differences really do arise, 'Fort Arbitration.'"

—Charles Richmond Henderson, Social Duties from a Christian Point of View, pp. 313-316.

The pacific methods of settling international disputes are designed to deal with legal differences and to as great an extent as possible with political differences. Practically no political difference, involving conflict between national policies, is without its distinctly legal side. The non-amicable methods of resolving international disputes—breaking diplomatic relations, retorsion, reprisal, embargo, nonintercourse, pacific blockade and intervention—are now practically obsolete and employed only by States of the first rank against those of lesser size or influence. Amicable methods include

negotiation, good offices and mediation, commissions of inquiry and arbitration. Of these methods, arbitration has held public attention almost to the exclusion of consideration of the other methods, which are of a less definite character. Of the other methods the commission of inquiry is capable of very great development. It is the medium chosen by President Wilson and Secretary of State Bryan for the advance toward assured peace which they desire to make, and the remarkable response to the Administration's project by the States of the entire world renders the subject a matter of public interest second to none. It may safely be said that no diplomatic proposition has ever made so rapid headway, for in eight months after the plan was broached, and in that short time it was accepted by thirty-one out of thirty-nine States, and seven treaties were signed. In two years fifteen treaties were in force and fifteen more signed.

The success of the Wilson-Bryan proposal may be defined as due to its strict adherence to the principle of the commission of inquiry; the advance it records is that of the greatest possible development within the limits of that principle. It brings forward into the range of practical affairs the well-attested maxim that war will not come in cold blood from a dispute the facts of which are thoroughly attested. It goes no further, for freedom of action is reserved by both parties after the commission's work is done.

—Denys P. Myers, The Commission of Inquiry, November, 1913.

## SOCIAL INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY

The sense of a great change comes over any one who watches the life of this nation with an eye for the stirring of God in the souls of men. There is a new shame and anger for oppression and meanness; a new love and pity for the young and frail whose slender shoulders bear our common

weight; a new faith in human brotherhood; a new hope of a better day that is even now in sight. We are inventing new phrases to name this new thing. We talk of the "social feeling" or "the new social consciousness." We are passing through a moral adolescence. When the spirit of manhood comes over a boy, his tastes change. The old doings of his gang lose interest. A new sense of duty, a new openness to ideal calls, a new capacity of self-sacrifice surprise those who used to know him. So in our conventions and clubs, our chambers of commerce and our legislatures, there is a new note, a stiffening of will, an impatience for cowardice, an enthusiastic turning toward real democracy. The old leaders are stumbling off the stage bewildered. There is a new type of leaders, and they and the people seem to understand one another as if by magic.

Were you ever converted to God? Do you remember the change in your attitude to all the world? Is not this new life which is running through our people the same great change on a national scale? This is religious energy, rising from the depth of the infinite spiritual life in which we all live and move and have our being. This is God.

—Walter Rauschenbusch, Christianizing the Social Order.

We are at last passing up into that realm of ethics where we are seeing that the same ethic is binding upon groups of people that controls and determines the relations of individuals to each other. The trouble has been that we have been living under two standards of ethics—Christian for individuals, pagan for groups, communities, nations. We have demanded that individuals live as Christians toward each other, but corporations and nations as pirates. But there is no such thing as a double standard of ethics in the kingdom of God. That which is right for a man is right for the state;

that which is wrong for a man to do is wrong for a corporation or nation to do. Taking things or land that do not belong to us is just as much stealing when done by a nation as when done by a man. If it is wrong for me to take revenge, it is wrong for a nation to take revenge. If it is wrong for me to settle my difficulties on the street with my fists, it is wrong for the nations to settle their difficulties on the seas with gunboats. Nations are under the same law of charity and forgiveness as individuals in any system of ethics that can last.

—Frederick Lynch, Some Untabulated Signs of World Unity, in Reports of the Third American Peace Congress, 1911, p. 414.

In all the lands where missionaries are active their influence has made for peace between European and Eastern. "No single person has done so much as the missionary to bring foreigners and the Japanese into close intercourse" is an opinion given in a Japanese newspaper. From Africa the same fact is attested. "For the preservation of peace between the colonists and the natives, one missionary is worth a battalion of soldiers," said Sir Charles Warren, governor of Natal.

—William E. Wilson, Christ and War, p. 197.

Jesus is the moral leader of the modern world. Even those who regard Him as neither unique nor divine, will seek to be like Him. —Amory H. Bradford.

The influence of Christianity in setting free the peace forces of human nature and human society, and starting them into activity, has been slow and not very uniform; but it has been incessant and sure, and some of the first fruit of it is just now being gathered.

This influence has been exerted through a Person, a Book, and a Society. The Founder of Christianity was a perfect peacemaker. He was not directly an anti-war prince. He said and did little directly about the practice of war as it existed everywhere about him. He seems to have ignored it. His work was positive and constructive. He was the Prince of Peace. . . .

The strife that he set going was that in which men conquer by patient loyalty to truth and by cheerfully allowing themselves to be killed for its sake; not that in which men draw the steel blade of violence to spill each other's blood.

Jesus Christ loved men. That was his life, his supreme motive, his only passion. He went about doing them good, in spirit and in body. There was nothing he would not do to help men; but he never did harm to anyone. He lifted not a finger of violence in self-defense or in defense of others. . . .

As with the Person, so with the Book. The New Testament is the Book of Peace. It says little about war as an institution. But the spirit of selfishness, envy, hate, retaliation and vengeance, out of which war springs, is everywhere reprobated on its pages. It exalts love to the supremest place among the virtues. It makes good will the heart of righteousness. Its great thesis is the Fatherhood and love of God manifested in a practical way in Jesus Christ. Love to God and love to man, self-sacrifice for others, forgiveness of injuries, non-resistance of evil with evil, overcoming evil with good, brotherly fellowship and peace, are the foremost of its practical teachings. . . .

These great principles of good will, mutual service and peace taught by Christ, transmitted in the New Testament, and operating, now strongly, now feebly, in the society which he formed, have gradually permeated the life of peoples and nations, and transformed their habits of thought, their

morals, customs, laws, and political institutions. The Christian society, speaking of it in the large, though often far from ideal, and frequently in parts of it Christian in almost nothing but name, has been instrumental in working out the conditions of universal and lasting federation and peace chiefly through the new and profounder idea, and the better example of kinship which it has presented. The kinship lying at the basis of Christian civilization, as its creative principle, is not the kinship of the *family,* under earthly parenthood, but the kinship of *man,* in the Fatherhood of God. —Benjamin F. Trueblood, The Federation of the World, pp. 56-63.

It is the function of religion to teach the individual to value his soul more than his body, and his moral integrity more than his income. In the same way it is the function of religion to teach society to value human life more than property, and to value property only in so far as it forms the material basis for the higher development of human life. When life and property are in apparent collision, life must take precedence. This is not only Christian but prudent. When commercialism in its headlong greed deteriorates the mass of human life, it defeats its own covetousness by killing the goose that lays the golden egg. Humanity is that goose —in more senses than one. It takes faith in the moral law to believe that this penny-wise craft is really suicidal folly, and to assert that wealth which uses up the people paves the way to beggary. Religious men have been cowed by the prevailing materialism and arrogant selfishness of our business world. They should have the courage of religious faith and assert that "man liveth not by bread alone," but by doing the will of God, and that the life of a nation "consisteth not in the abundance of things" which it produces, but in the way men live justly with one another and humbly with their God.

When the social activity of the church is discussed, it is usually assumed that the churches are to influence legislation and to watch over the execution of the laws. The churches are within their rights in doing both. There are probably few denominations which would hesitate a moment to fling their full force on a legislature if the tenure of their property or the freedom of their church administration were threatened. If it is right to lobby in their own behalf, it cannot well be wrong to lobby on behalf of the people.

But we have an exaggerated idea of the importance of laws. Our legislative bodies are the greatest law factories the world has ever seen. Our zest for legislation blinds us to the subtle forces behind and beyond the law. Those influences which really make and mar human happiness and greatness are beyond the reach of the law. The law can compel a man to support his wife, but it cannot compel him to love her, and what are ten dollars a week to a woman whose love lies in broken shards at her feet? The law can compel a father to provide for his children and can interfere if he maltreats them, but it cannot compel him to give them that lovingly fatherly intercourse which puts backbone into a child forever. The law can keep neighbors from trespassing, but it cannot put neighborly courtesy and good will into their relations. The State can establish public schools and hire teachers, but it cannot put enthusiasm and moral power into their work; yet those are the qualities which distinguish the few true teachers to whom we look back in after years as the real makers of our lives. The highest qualities and influences are beyond the law and must be created elsewhere.

The law is a moral agency, as effective and as rough as a policeman's club, sweeping in its operation and unable to adjust itself to individual needs and the finer shadings of moral life. It furnishes the stiff skeleton of public morality which supports the finer tissues, but these tissues must be

deposited by other forces. The State is the outer court of the moral law; within stands the sanctuary of the Spirit. Religion creates morality, and morality then deposits a small part of its contents in written laws. The State can protect the existing morality and promote the coming morality, but the vital creative force of morality lies deeper.

The law becomes impotent if it is not supported by a diffused, spontaneous moral impulse in the community. If religion implants love, mutual helpfulness, and respect for the life and rights of others, there will be little left to do for the law and its physical force. The stronger the silent moral compulsion of the community, the less need for the physical compulsion of the State. If parents have to resort to physical punishment constantly, it furnishes presumptive evidence that their training has been defective in its moral factors. If we have to order out the militia frequently to quell riots and protect property, it constitutes a charge of inefficiency against the religious and educational institutions of the community.

Thus it is clear that the Church has a large field for social activity before touching legislation. It cannot make laws, but it can make customs, and *"quid leges sine moribus?"* Of what avail are laws without customs? Our two words, "morals" and "ethics," the one from the Latin and the other from the Greek, both mean that which is customary. There is a singular lack of appreciation in American thought for the importance of custom; possibly because in our new and plastic life customs are less rigid and formative than anywhere else on earth. Yet our life, too, is ruled largely by unenacted laws. Our helpfulness toward children and old people, our respect for womanhood and the consequent unparalleled freedom of woman's social intercourse, the comparative disappearance of profanity and obscenity from conversation—all this rests on custom and not on law, and

these customs are in large part the product of purified modern religion.

—Walter Rauschenbusch, Christianity and the Social Crisis, pp. 372-375.

When we reflect upon the influence with which all unprejudiced thinkers admit that Christianity has aided civilization in so many quarters, the poverty of its attainment in the direction of suppressing war cries aloud for explanation. And there is one characteristic feature of the teaching of nearly every orthodox exponent of the relation of the attitude of religion to war which, in the writer's judgment, goes a very long way to explain it. This feature is the general practice of making the right or wrong of war solely a question of *motive*. By this line of teaching the intrinsic evil inherent in war itself has been habitually obscured, and invaluable moral force has run to waste in casuistry, which ought to have been concentrated on quickening the conscience of the world. That conscience has been perpetually assisted to escape from the Castle of Decision by this miserable postern door. Did ever a war break out which, in one aspect or another, could not affect a claim to justification from motive? And is it not largely because the Christian consciousness has been trained to accept this plea as valid, that the barbarity of war is still rampant in Christendom?

Buckle maintains, though unconvincingly, that civilization neither has been nor can be aided by religion in this matter. But if anything connected with the world's slow deliverance from its slavery to war, could give to that contention the appearance of validity, it would be the obvious impotence of religious forces tied and bound by this fetish of motive. As long as the criminality of war itself is thus left open, more may well be done for its abolishment by efforts which leave right and wrong out of count, and urge only war's anachro-

nistic folly and futility. For history abundantly shows that to justify bad conduct by a good initial motive may prove quite as maleficent as to teach that a good end can justify atrocious means.

—William Leighton Grane, The Passing of War, p. 140. (The Macmillan Company, Publishers.)

**SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY**

The question at last emerges, Why should Christianity be taught at all, if it is unfit to be taught fully? Why should any profess the ideas of Jesus, if it is not possible to carry them right through life and politics? To brand them as right but impossible is to brand him as a utopian of the worst kind. Are the teachings impracticable? or practicable? If the former, why do we call him a great teacher? If the latter, why do we refuse to obey them? If he taught what cannot be lived, what becomes of him? Or if we decline to live according to what he taught, what becomes of us? Let the war church make its choice. . . .

The problem is, How to make Christendom a doer, as well as a hearer, of the word of peace—how to bring the ideal law of love down into the life of to-day, how to weave the Sermon into modern society, how to make the Beatitudes the driving force of politics, how to make the Christ ruler in his own house, how to cast out the legion devils that haunt the tombs of the world's battlefields, how to substitute the cross for the sword. If the church can solve this problem, she will live. If she cannot, she will die; and die unlamented. If the church cannot destroy war, war has already destroyed the church. And that enormous deed is the measure of the guilt, stupidity, and madness of the war spirit.

—Walter Walsh, The Moral Damage of War, pp. 263-265.

Propaganda against war is intimately connected with any

movement for social progress and any agitation which has this object in view. War in the past was the daughter of ignorance and vice and the mother of injustice. Were it to assume its former sway in modern society, it would generate sloth, ignorance, and injustice in an aggravated form. War is, in itself, a pure injustice, and this alone ought to suffice to induce men to do all in their power to abolish it; for injustice is the origin of all evil, of the physical evils of disease, pestilence, and premature death, of the moral ones of madness, crime, and all suffering which is the invisible but inseparable companion of mankind on earth. How many men have not asked themselves, in face of so much atrocious suffering which appears inexplicable because unmerited: "What is the cause of so much pain in life?" A terrible and august reason there is, to be sure of it. The baby who dies in its cradle, the youth who is killed by consumption, the man who goes mad in the flower of his years, the son who inherits his father's disease, the degenerate who becomes a criminal, the neurotic who passes his existence tormented and tormenting, the unfortunate who succumbs to a broken heart on account of one of those thousand injuries which men blindly exchange in the thick of the struggle for wealth and honor—all of these are the expiatory victims of the innumerable injustices which every society tolerates in its midst, and for which we are responsible, one and all, by reason of an iron law of solidarity which admits of no immunity nor privilege. The sin may not always have been committed by the man who expiates it. But what matters this? The process by which justice is dealt does not directly affect individuals, but the whole of society. Only in a society totally free from injustice would man be absolutely liberated from evil. That society would no longer be afflicted with invalids, criminals, lunatics, paupers, vicious or unhappy men. The seed once destroyed, the bitter fruit could no longer ripen.

For this reason society unconsciously always tends toward a greater degree of justice, because injustice leads to suffering, and man ever tries to avoid pain.

—Guglielmo Ferrero, Militarism, pp. 318, 319.

Every great evolution demands a great idea to be its center of action; to furnish it with both lever and fulcrum for the work it has to do. What great idea has the Christian Church which will serve as the religious lever and fulcrum for the engineering task of the present generation? What great faith has it which will inspire the religious minds of our modern world in the regeneration of society?

The chief purpose of the Christian Church in the past has been the salvation of individuals. But the most pressing task of the present is not individualistic. Our business is to make over an antiquated and immoral economic system; to get rid of laws, customs, maxims, and philosophies inherited from an evil and despotic past; to create just and brotherly relations between great groups and classes of society; and thus to lay a social foundation on which modern men individually can live and work in a fashion that will not outrage all the better elements in them. Our inherited Christian faith dealt with individuals; our present task deals with society.

—Walter Rauschenbusch, Christianizing the Social Order, p. 40.

## STRONG ENOUGH TO DO RIGHT

The present policy of great military and naval expenditures by the Christian nations is a travesty on our Christianity. When Dr. David Starr Jordan went to Japan as a representative of the World Peace Foundation, he was cordially received by that nation. But it was significant and just that the press of that country should criticize the conditions which prevailed

in lands which, while holding great peace congresses and sending out peace workers, continue to increase their own equipments for war. It is all-important to have international conferences and treaties, but I believe that, if our nation would, without waiting for any other, take the initiative and call a halt in our great expenditures for naval armament, the world would soon follow us. *We are strong enough to do what is right.* Who is going to attack us? Not England, whom we love to recognize as our "mother country"; not France, who gave us Lafayette and other leaders in the war of the Revolution, and who has never ceased to be our friend; not Germany—why should she cut off her hundreds of millions of dollars of business with us, her best customer across the sea, and threaten revolution within from her business, manufacturing, and labor interests? not Japan, whose people, as a whole, love us as their best and most faithful friend, who know also that they could not safely add to their present burdensome debt, and that the hour of conflict with us would be the hour for Russia to recapture Port Arthur and Korea. The men who try to stir up strife between our nation and Japan or any other nation are guilty of high treason. I am not unfamiliar with the argument that an increasingly stronger navy is an assurance of peace. But there is another side to this; namely, the temptation there is to provoke a quarrel in order to use these ships. Colonel Gädke, a German military officer of acknowledged authority, has recently said, "It is only partly true that armaments are the insurance premiums of peace; with better right they might be called a constant menace to peace." Von Moltke many years ago said in the Reichstag that it is mutual distrust which keeps the nations in arms against one another. Can any one imagine anything that will more surely create distrust than to be continually adding battleship to battleship? Our navy kept efficient at its present size is large enough for all pur-

poses of defense; and the thought of anything besides defense in connection with it is wicked.

We shall be false to the missionary interest we hold in trust—yea, more, we shall be false to him who is the Prince of Peace—unless we are more earnest and determined in this matter.

—Samuel B. Capen, Foreign Missions and World Peace.

When are "religious" people, for example, going to allow Religion, which is the deepest principle of Unity among men, to become the great God-ordained Unifier of the Race? How long is it scandalously to remain, in Mr. Balfour's phrase, "the great Divider of mankind!"

Why, even a heathen out of a pre-Christian past, or a Hindoo Brahman or Japanese Buddhist of our own day, may put our boasted Christianity to shame! Here is the wisdom of Greece three hundred years before Christ: "Look to the spirit, not to the letter; to the intention, not to the action; to the character of the actor in the long run, not in the present moment. Remember good rather than evil. Wish to settle a matter by words rather than by deeds." Here speaks India, in the nineteenth century after Christ: "To be a Christian, then, is to be Christlike," says Kesub Chundah Sen—"not acceptance of Christ as a proposition, or as an outward representation; but spiritual conformity with the life and character of Christ. . . . Allow me, friends, to say that England is not yet a Christian nation."

—William Leighton Grane, The Passing of War, Extract from p. 118. (The Macmillan Company, Publishers.)

What America and every other so-called Christian people chiefly needs in order to promote "international conciliation," is less of unscrupulous greed in its own business, less of personal and selfish ambition in its own politics, more of the

spirit of wisdom and of righteousness in its pulpits, and less of hypocrisy in its churches.

—George Trumbull Ladd, America and Japan p. 4, in Documents of The American Association for International Conciliation, 1907-08.

If you push to its logical conclusion that spirit of humaneness which prompted Henri Dunant to organize the Red Cross, you never can be satisfied to tolerate the infliction of preventable sufferings upon human beings through war which in our day has become entirely unnecessary.

—Charles E. Beals, From Jungleism to Internationalism, in Reports of the Fourth American Peace Congress, p. 183.

Our country cannot do what an individual cannot do. Therefore it must not vaunt or be puffed up. Rather bend to unperformed duties. Independence is not all. We have but half done when we have made ourselves free. The scornful taunt wrung from bitter experience of the great Revolution in France must not be leveled at us: "They wish to be *free,* but know not how to be *just.*" Nor is priceless Freedom an end in itself, but rather the means of Justice and Beneficence, where alone is enduring concord, with that attendant happiness which is the final end and aim of Nations, as of every human heart. It is not enough to be free. There must be Peace which cannot fail, and other nations must share the great possession. For this good must we labor, bearing ever in mind two special objects, complements of each other: first, the Arbitrament of War must end; and, secondly, Disarmament must begin. With this ending and this beginning the great gates of the Future will be opened, and the guardian virtues will assert a new empire. Alas! until this is done,

National Honor and National Glory will yet longer flaunt in blood, and there can be no True Grandeur of Nations.

To this great work let me summon you. That Future, which filled the lofty vision of sages and bards in Greece and Rome, which was foretold by Prophets and heralded by Evangelists, when man, in Happy Isles, or in a new Paradise, shall confess the loveliness of Peace, may you secure, if not for yourselves, at least for your children! *Believe* that you can do it, and you *can* do it.

—CHARLES SUMNER, Addresses on War, pp. 128, 129.

**Trumpeter, sound for the splendor of God!**
**Sound the music whose name is law,**
**Whose service is perfect freedom still,**
**The order august that rules the stars!**
**Bid the anarchs of night withdraw.**
**Too long the destroyers have worked their will.**
**Sound for the last, the last of the wars!**
**Sound for the heights that our fathers trod,**
**When truth was truth and love was love,**
**With a hell beneath, but a heaven above,**
**Trumpeter, rally us, rally us, rally us,**
**On to the City of God.**

## CHAPTER XII

## THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CHRISTIAN

A great task demands a great faith. To live a great life a man needs a great cause to which he can surrender; something divinely large and engrossing for which he can live, and if need be, die.

### A PSALM OF THE HELPERS

The ways of the world are full of haste and turmoil:
I will sing of the tribe of helpers who travel in peace.

He that turneth from the road to rescue another,
Turneth toward his goal:
He shall arrive in due time by the foot-path of mercy,
God will be his guide.

He that taketh up the burden of the fainting,
Lighteneth his own load:
The Almighty will put His arms underneath him,
He shall lean upon the Lord.

He that speaketh comfortable words to mourners,
Healeth his own heart:
In times of grief they will return to remembrance,
God will use them for balm.

He that careth for the sick and wounded,
Watcheth not alone:
There are three in the darkness together,
And the third is the Lord.

Blessed is the way of the helpers:
The companions of the Christ.

—HENRY VAN DYKE.

## EACH MAN'S RESPONSIBILITY

At first thought the ordinary modest Christian in humble private station, remote from the diplomatic circles of Washington, is inclined to imagine that affairs of international magnitude do not concern him, that they belong to the secrets of state, that his ignorance and lack of political influence excuse him from responsibility in such high and complicated matters. But morality has no national boundaries, and the claims of neighborliness are valid between kings and republics. The rulers of men are servants of God and history shows that they are better men and governors if watched by an intelligent people who love righteousness and hate iniquity. President Nicholas Murray Butler has well said:

"One of the chief problems of our time is to bring the nations' minds and the nations' consciences to bear on the moral problems involved in international relations. This is a step in the moral education of the world."

And at the same meeting Rear-Admiral C. F. Goodrich stated an important truth:

"When the people want peace, they will have peace; when they want war, they will have war, and they are likely to want that of which most is sung and written and spoken. The more we talk about peace, the less our chance of war. . . . You must labor with these gentlemen of the press, that they use their mighty powers toward allaying race hatred and toward sweetening and brightening international relations, that they report the graces and virtues of men of alien blood and speech, not their supposed defects of character, and so shall they bring all nations of earth together in that perfect understanding and sympathy in which war can have no place."

There is not a person of intelligence so obscure in the republic that he can escape responsibility. . . .

—Charles Richmond Henderson, Social Duties from the Christian Point of View, p. 300.

If such socialization of fraternity is ever to come, it must needs be through the transformation of actual human lives. National morality cannot be far in advance of individual morality. —Shailer Mathews.

It is our business carefully to cultivate in our minds, to rear to the utmost vigor and maturity every sort of generous and honest feeling that belongs to our nature; to bring the dispositions that are lovely in private life into the service and conduct of the commonwealth; so to be patriots as not to forget that we are gentlemen. —Edmund Burke.

War is dying, though it strikes hard from the death coil. It has been slain by science. It has been slain by democracy.

Between militarism and democracy the feud is eternal. As the spirit of manhood rises the war spirit must fail.

So the day of peace is coming. Which shall it be, the Peace of Force or the Peace of Law? We may work for either. We cannot have both. Every man has some influence in forming public opinion, and, at the last, the world is ruled by what its people think. You have a vote in world affairs. Its weight depends on your intelligence and your integrity. How shall your vote be cast?

—David Starr Jordan, War and Waste,
Extract from p. 290.

Believe you can do it and you can do it.

—Sumner.

If I kept such a faith with what is called the company, *I must break the faith, the covenant, the solemn, original, indispensable oath, in which I am bound by the eternal frame and constitution of things to the whole human race.*

—Edmund Burke.

The reproach of being impracticable attaches by right not to those who insist on resolute, persistent, and uncompromising effort to remove abuses, but to a very different class—to those, namely, who are credulous enough to suppose that abuses, and bad customs, and wasteful ways of doing things, will remove themselves. —Lord Morley.

The habit of seeing things as they are is indispensable to moral earnestness. —Felix Adler.

It is for us to bring conviction to the masses that this question of peace cannot be handled successfully by a few people. It is a work for the whole world. We must do our part toward bringing the subject so forcefully before each and every one that all will feel that it is necessary to take a hand in it. We go about our vocations of every kind, giving ninety-nine per cent of our time and money to them, with hardly a thought or a dollar to the greatest of all needs, and expect these terrible evils of war will be done away with—that in some way the powers of the earth or the heavens will remove them. Great changes in the established order of things do not come about in this way. The All-Wise Power has no hands or voices but ours. He must work through His creatures; and, if we fail to take up His commands, the work will have to wait. Latent feeling must be transformed into action. The peace leaders have not impressed the people sufficiently with the idea that this is a work that must be undertaken by the people as a whole in a large way if any great change is to be made, and that it will never succeed with an indefinite and uncertain source of supply. We must place responsibility as broadly as possible upon the people, and ask each to take a hand in contributions of both money and time. It is not enough for the minister in the pulpit to devote one Sunday in the year to a peace sermon; nor for the teacher in the school to give

one day in the year to peace lessons; nor the newspaper one editorial in the year; nor the men of business and finance to have a convention once a year to talk over these matters. All must be awakened to the necessity of taking a vital hand in this work. The future of our cause depends especially upon the cooperation of vigorous young men who wish to devote their whole lives to carrying it forward; and to such our schools and colleges and churches and the press should earnestly appeal.

—Edwin Ginn, Organizing the Peace Work.

That man has no right to violate the conscience of his fellowman is a truth which few, under the light of the gospel, since the days of ignorance and superstition, have ventured to call in question.

But military governments, from their very nature, necessarily infringe on the consciences of men. Though the Word of God requires implicit obedience to rulers in all things not contrary to the Scriptures, it utterly forbids compliance with such commands as are inconsistent with the gospel. We must obey God rather than man, and fear God as well as honor the king. But governments, whether monarchial or republican, make laws as they please, and compel obedience at the point of the sword. They declare wars, and call upon all their subjects to support them.

—David Low Dodge, War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ, p. 52.

No great uplift of humanity, no great movement in civilization, but has found its path to success in the developed moral sense of man. No great change in civilized institutions but has found itself produced by the dynamic, moving forces of morality.

—Victor Morris, Man's Moral Nature the Hope of Universal Peace, in Prize Orations, p. 155.

Men acting singly, recognizing their individual responsibility to God, and men acting in masses where responsibility is distributed and divided, where men are made better or worse by their association, according to the cause which unifies them, seem often to be entirely different men. When good men unite in a good cause every man seems to rise to a clearer intelligence, to a higher competency, to a larger heartedness. When men of average virtue unite in a bad cause it seems to blind and degrade every one of them. When bad men unite in a bad cause the worst man, with the lowest principles, and the most inhuman methods of action, seems to be the hero of the occasion. It requires an exceedingly thoughtful man always to be consistent with himself. A story is told in New England of a celebrated professor and a distinguished Unitarian minister, in war time, walking arm in arm down one of our Boston streets, and discussing the imprecatory Psalms. The Unitarian would even thrust them out of the canon of Scripture as belonging to a barbarous age. A few yards further and these gentlemen came upon a newspaper office. On the bulletin board was the announcement of a victory by the Federal over the Confederate forces, with the words appended, "The Confederates severely punished." "Served them right," exclaimed the Unitarian; "the rascals; I hope they'll get all the whipping they deserve." "But what of your imprecatory Psalms?" asked the professor; "I fear there are imprecatory Psalms in you, my friend." . . .

I know that injustice may be done to military men, as if wars invariably originated with them. I have remarked often how unwarlike in tone and temper are most of the men who were active soldiers in the war of the Rebellion in the United States. They know what war is. Did not General Grant, when in England, refuse to appear at a military review? The great soldier had seen so much of war, so much of its horrors, as well as of its "pomp and circumstance," that he wished

never again to see another regiment of soldiers. If ever there was a hero, General Grant was one. Let us not libel the soldier. Who that remembers such men as Havelock, Lawrence, and other great Indian heroes; who that remembers such men as Stonewall Jackson, Sherman, Thomas, Meade, and such men as these, does not recognize virtuous, humane, sometimes saintly, always heroic, men—men, however, who once in the stream, must be borne along into the rapids, and could never again reach the banks to which pastoral peace invited them. Not the soldiers, but the politicians, make the wars. If those who made the quarrels were the only men to fight, wars would be few and far between. We could very well spare some of these men. It would be a great relief if the places that know them now should know them no more forever. It is impossible not to honor brave and bold men, whether it be those under Miltiades at Marathon, or the equally noble six hundred at Balaclava, whether it be Wellington's Old Guard, or Cromwell's Ironsides. It ought to be impossible to honor men who, with no tears in their eyes and no agony in their hearts stir up strife between nations.

—Reuen Thomas, The War System, p. 3.

The great searchlight of morality must be turned on war —a searchlight which is always bright and strong and which never has failed to reveal the truth. To turn this on full and strong means to awaken the consciences of men. It must be an individual proposition—not simply the developed consciences of a few leaders who may be submerged by the war spirit of the masses, but there must be developed consciences of all the people individually. All our arbitration treaties and the actual settlement of disputes by arbitration are of great value and should be pressed as far as possible; but are these sufficient forces to develop the consciences of men against war as an immorality and a sin? What are the forces

that have always come to our support against an immorality and a sin?

How about our churches? Have they been doing their duty? Have they made it clear that war is sin and war is crime? Has not the church been too easy? Has its voice sounded clear and strong on this world-evil? Surely a duty rests upon the ministry to be insistent in its characterization of war.—Victor Morris, Man's Moral Nature the Hope of Universal Peace, in Prize Orations, pp. 153, 154.

**INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM**

Government is instituted for one and a single end—the benefit of the governed, the protection, peace, and welfare of society; and when it is perverted to other objects, to purposes of avarice, ambition, or party spirit, we are authorized and even bound to make such opposition as is suited to restore it to its proper end, to render it as pure as the imperfection of our nature and state will admit.

The Scriptures have sometimes been thought to enjoin an unqualified, unlimited subjection to the "higher powers"; but in the passages which seem so to teach, it is supposed that these powers are "ministers of God for good," are a terror to evildoers, and an encouragement to those that do well. When a government wants this character, when it becomes an engine of oppression, the Scriptures enjoin subjection no longer. Expediency may make it our duty to obey, but the government has lost its rights; it can no longer urge its claims as an ordinance of God.

—William Ellery Channing, Discourses on War, pp. 114, 115.

The highest aim of all authority is to confer liberty. This is true of domestic rule. The great, we may say the single, object of parental government, of a wise and virtuous educa-

tion, is to give the child the fullest use of his own powers; to give him inward force; to train him up to govern himself. The same is true of the authority of Jesus Christ. He came indeed to rule mankind, but to rule them not by arbitrary statutes, not by force and menace, nor by mere will, but by setting before them, in precept and life, those everlasting rules of rectitude which heaven obeys and of which every soul contains the living germ. . . .

Of civil government, too, the great end is to secure freedom. Its proper and highest function is to watch over the liberties of each and all, and to open to a community the widest field for all its powers. Its very chains and prisons have the general freedom for their aim. They are just only when used to curb oppression and wrong; to disarm him who has a tyrant's heart if not a tyrant's power, who wars against others' rights, who by invading property or life would substitute force for the reign of equal laws. Freedom—we repeat it—is the end of government. To exalt men to self-rule is the end of all other rule; and he who would fasten on them his arbitrary will is their worst foe.

—WILLIAM ELLERY CHANNING, Discourses on War, pp. 139, 140.

**IDEALS MADE REAL**

Ideals do not become less ideal because they become more closely associated with material welfare.

The Christian saint who would allow the nails of his fingers to grow through the palm of his clasped hand would excite, not our admiration, but our revolt. More and more is religious effort being subjected to this test: does it make for the improvement of society? If not, it stands condemned. Political ideals will inevitably follow a like development, and will be more and more subject to a like test. Lecky has summarized the tendency thus: "Interest as distinguished from

passion (and if we read for 'passion' unreasoned emotion the generalization confirms my point) gains a greater empire with advancing civilization."

Progress of this kind here is not marked by a betterment of ideal—a betterment of intention. There was probably as much good intention, as much readiness for self-sacrifice, in the Europe of Simon Stylites as in the Europe of our day; there is perhaps as much to-day in Hindustan or Arabia as in England. But what differentiates the twentieth from the fifth century, or Arabic from British civilization, is a difference of ideas due to hard mental work; the prime, if not the sole factor of advance is hard thinking.

That brings us to what I believe to be the real distinction, if any, between the older and the newer pacifism—namely that the older Pacifists appealed to an intuitive unanalyzed ideal, which they did not justify by a process of reasoning, while the New Pacifists attempt to obtain their results by analysis, by showing the how and why of certain facts in human relations, instead of merely holding up an ideal without the process of rationalistic justification. . . .

I do not believe that the man who achieves his conviction as the result of a process of reasoning is less sincere, or has necessarily less fervor, than the man who holds his conviction by intuition—by the inner light. The defender of an old inherited conception is often undoubtedly sincere, but the reformer who has thought himself into new conceptions, modifying and qualifying the old, has generally as great a fervor; and a new movement of ideas like those of the Reformation or the French Revolution, which were in their beginnings purely a matter of argument and discussion, often abstruse, in their development may inflame millions to a high pitch of passion and fervor. . . .

What we call public opinion does not descend upon us from the outside, is not something outside our acts and volition, but

the reflection of those acts; it is not made for us, we make it. That we are the instruments of our own salvation, that without the act of the individual there can be no salvation, is a truth that has the sanction alike of economics, of morals, and of religion. And the contrary view—that nothing that we can do will affect our destiny—is one that the Western World and its religion have rejected. For to the degree to which it is accepted it involves stagnation and decline. If it were true it would take from the finer activities of life all that gives dignity to human society, since it would make of men the blind puppets of the brute forces of nature. It would imply the decay and death of the human soul, of the better things for which men live.

—Norman Angell, Arms and Industry, pp. 53-85.
(G. P. Putnam's Sons, Publishers.)

Let us consider the point of difference between illusion and ideal, and note that an ideal is an idea or mental picture of something that ought to be. The ideal condemns the actual. There would be no need of an ideal if the actual were what it ought to be—perfect as it ought to be. Every ideal condemns the actual, but it also as an ideal appreciates the actual in so far as the actual conditions lend themselves to betterment. There could be no ideal if the actual were not capable of being made what it ought to be. The ideal has just these two implications—always against the actual, depreciating it, and always for it, appreciating it. Now an illusion is the notion that what ought to be can be realized immediately, without working over the actual, without effort, without pain—at least with a minimum of effort and pain. We need but to form a few peace societies, build a Peace Temple at The Hague, call mass meetings and pass resolutions, recommend apparently simple devices like an international police—anything ready to hand, anything easy, to bring about what ought

to be. That is characteristic of the illusion. The ideal is stern; it contemplates the actual and sees how difficult it is to change it, although it is anything but despondent, and sees that the actual certainly is capable of being changed. The illusion—the immediate illusion—is that at the end of this war people will have become so tired of massacre and destruction of property that some small device, calling for but slight effort, will serve to effect the longed-for change in human society. This is the illusion which must be denounced, for it is a deception of oneself; and it is due, in a certain sense, to a moral fault in those who are obsessed by it. The illusionists are at bottom joy-loving people, who do not realize that the world is not made for enjoyment, and shirk the toil which is laid upon mankind.

It is said that the character of certain kinds of material, wood or stone, because of the grain, or one or another resistance, makes it difficult for the sculptor to work in them and to realize his ideal image. But in these resistances the true artist finds his education. He is compelled by these very obstacles in the material to ponder and consider, to mature his ideal image, to gain a closer grip of it. The difficulties which mankind experiences in moralizing the human race are like those which the artist experiences in carving the hard wood or the stone; the very difficulties are the means of educating mankind, of helping the world to visualize its ideals, to conceive them more truly, to test them, so that if they do not work perhaps because they are themselves not yet right or just, they can be further perfected. The resistance we meet is a challenge compelling us to mature our moral ideals, and the justification of our efforts in the world lies precisely in the closer grip we obtain on ideal realities. It is never in the fact that we house them in the actual world. That we never do. Our reward is in our surer understanding, our firmer possession of the ideal as reality.

It sometimes happens that an illusion is due to pity. Under very great stress, deep feeling is apt to breed illusions. For instance, you see the suffering of the poor. The more your pity is stirred up the less are you willing to wait for a remedy. This state of things, you exclaim, is intolerable, and there must be relief. Therefore you ask for a cure that will work at once. But the real remedies never work in that way. They work slowly, gradually. Yet, when feeling is wrought up, then a gradual remedy is scouted; you insist on one that shall work promptly and completely. This is the origin of social utopias.

Such also is the origin of the illusion of peace. Our feelings are wrought up; we hear about the massacres; the young men, the flower of Europe are being slain; mothers are deprived of their sons, sweethearts of their lovers, wives of their husbands. We say this is intolerable, we cannot endure it; we cry out for a remedy, a quick remedy, for something that promises to give immediate relief.

Now the danger is that people whose feelings are very much wrought up will overlook the real difficulties in the way of removing the evil condition. The illusionist often does more harm than good. It may be that he does good in stirring up our conscience. But he also paves the way for disappointment, disillusion. Those who indulge in the hope of a quick and a durable peace are apt to single out such factors in the actual situation as seem favorable to their dream, but ignore or are incapable of estimating those that are opposed to their remedy. They fasten on international courts, as if the case of strife between nations were the same as that between individuals. Or they depend on pity, and say pity will conquer; sympathy has more power and is more general to-day than ever before. Or why cannot we appeal to self-interest? War is unprofitable to the victor and the vanquished, said Jean Bloch and Norman Angell—and war,

utterly unprofitable war, presently happened. There are certain factors in the situation which give a plausible color to the quick remedies while the illusionists overlook the things that make for war. . . .

I do not wish to dampen the belief in peace, which I share, but rather to dispel the illusion—as if the Golden Vision were entering the gate, as if the beautiful feet of those who bring glad tidings of peace were already discernible on the mountains. The habit of seeing things as they are is indispensable to moral earnestness. It is immoral not to try to see things as they are. We can only overcome difficulties if we first clearly see them.

—Felix Adler, The Illusion and the Ideal of International Peace, The Standard, February, 1915.

Our entire generation needs a faith, for it is confronting the mightiest task ever undertaken consciously by any generation of men. Our civilization is passing through a great historic transition. We are at the parting of the ways. The final outcome may be the decay and extinction of Western civilization, or it may be a new epoch in the evolution of the race, compared with which our present era will seem like a modified barbarism. We now have such scientific knowledge of social laws and forces, of economics, of history, that we can intelligently mold and guide the evolution in which we take part. Our fathers cowered before the lightning; we have subdued it to our will. Former generations were swept along more or less blindly toward a hidden destiny; we have reached the point where we can make history make us. Have we the will to match our knowledge? Can we marshal the moral forces capable of breaking what must be broken, and then building what must be built? What spiritual hosts can God line up to rout the devil in the battle of Armageddon?

Our moral efficiency depends on our religious faith. The

force of will, of courage, of self-sacrifice liberated by a living religious faith is so incalculable, so invincible, that nothing is impossible when that power enters the field. The author of the greatest revolution in history made the proposition that even the slightest amount of faith is competent to do the unbelievable; faith as tiny as a mustard seed can blast away mountains.

—Walter Rauschenbusch, Christianizing the Social Order, p. 40.

**A HIGHER INDIVIDUAL STANDARD**

We have made more progress in intelligence than in kindness. For thousands of generations, and until very recent times, one of the chief occupations of men has been to plunder, bruise, and kill one another. . . . The tender and unselfish feelings, which are a later product of evolution, have too seldom been allowed to grow strong from exercise; and the whims and prejudices of militant barbarism are slow in dying out from the midst of peaceful industrial civilization. The coarser forms of cruelty are disappearing and the butchery of men has greatly diminished. But most people apply to industrial pursuits a notion of antagonism derived from ages of warfare, and seek in all manner of ways to cheat or overreach each other. And as in more barbarous times the hero was he who had slain his tens of thousands, so now the man who has made wealth by overreaching his neighbors is not uncommonly spoken of in terms that imply approval. . . . Nevertheless, in all these respects some improvements have been made. . . . The manifestations of selfish and hateful feeelings will be more and more sternly repressed by public opinion and such feelings will become weakened by disuse. Human progress means throwing off the brute inheritance—gradually throwing it off through ages of struggle that are by and by to make struggle needless. Man is slowly

passing from a primitive social state toward an ultimate social state in which his character will be so transformed that nothing of the brute can be detected in it. . . . The process of evolution is an advance toward true salvation.

—JOHN FISKE.

Man's conception of his duty to his neighbor has been modified by three relations of affinity—race, creed, and color; and each of these affinities has been the motive of conflict between the communities it has included and those it has excluded.

The history of civilization is the history of the evolution of conscience in controlling the policy of the included to the excluded communities in these conflicts. It presents an orderly process of development through three stages, each exhibiting a dominant policy—a policy of extermination, a policy of servitude, and a policy of amalgamation. By amalgamation I mean union in the same community as masters and servants, as fellow-laborers, as fellow-citizens, and, if possible, but not necessarily, as connected by intermarriage.

—SIR CHARLES BRUCE, Papers on Inter-Racial Problems, p. 280.

Nearly three thousand years ago a mighty poet, an idealist, lifted up his voice amidst a nation of armed men and dared to sing of a day when men "shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

Many centuries have passed since those words were uttered, and still the nations of the earth, the most highly civilized among those nations, spend of the best of their skill, their science, and their energy, in forging engines of destruction. But we have at least traveled so far along the road toward

universal peace that by a large and growing body of opinion in all the more civilized countries the prophecy of Isaiah is regarded not as the dream-picture of another world, but as a definite and attainable goal toward which the nations of this world are surely moving.

—Dorothy M. Hunter, Anglo-German Trade and the Unmeasured Costs of War, p. 1.

That war and policy are closely bound together is undeniable. What then, is policy? Policy in this connection represents the general interests of a whole community. What determines policy? Public opinion. What determines public opinion? The view of its interests which most commends itself to the community. And what will determine that view? The stage of development reached by the social sense of the community. Upon that will depend the sort of policy pursued; that sort which naturally completes itself in war, or that which is perfected in peace.

Thus the cardinal importance of using every possible means of fostering the social sense is patent. Such means were happily summarized, one hundred and fifty years ago, by "the greatest man since Milton," as Macaulay called him—Edmund Burke: "It is our business carefully to cultivate in our minds, to rear, to the utmost vigor and maturity, every sort of generous and honest feeling that belongs to our nature; to bring the dispositions that are lovely in private life into the service and conduct of the commonwealth; so to be patriots as not to forget that we are gentlemen."

However slow the movement, the world advances. There are thousands in England to-day, for every ten in Burke's day, who can see something more profound than platitude in his maxim, "There is no qualification for government but wisdom and virtue, actual or presumptive. Wherever they are actually found they have, in whatever state, condition,

profession or trade, the passport of heaven to human place and honor."

As Dr. Montagu Butler reminds us, "India is still, as it was a hundred years ago, the truest touchstone of England's conscience." Compare, then, Burke's outlook on Indian affairs (to which he gave fourteen years of laborious and unbroken study) with the outlook of statesmanship in our own day; and realize the change in social consciousness involved. Burke's scathing indictment of the "Company" for vulgar heartlessness, as much as for downright cruelty, is as historical as his more famous impeachment of Hastings. The stock plea was that the public faith was plighted to their charter; but for Burke any such fidelity to crime appeared simply intolerable cant. "If I kept such a faith with what is called the Company, *I must break the faith, the covenant, the solemn, original, indispensable oath, in which I am bound by the eternal frame and constitution of things to the whole human race.*" There speaks the ideal citizen, who already held that "all persons possessing any portion of power ought to be strongly and awfully impressed with the idea that they act in trust, and that they are to account for their conduct to the one great Master, Author, and Founder of Society," and that nothing in heaven or earth is surer than the retribution in store for tyranny and the petty greed of the oppressor. "If we make ourselves too little for the sphere of our duty; if we do not stretch and expand our minds to the compass of their object; be well assured that everything about us will dwindle by degrees, until at length our concerns are shrunk to the dimensions of our minds."

—William Leighton Grane, The Passing of War, Extracts from pp. 110-112. (The Macmillan Co., Pubs.)

## CONSECRATION TO A GREAT CAUSE

The greatest criminals, I verily believe, on God's earth

to-day would be the politicians and the reckless, irresponsible newspaper writers, who would deliberately sow the seeds of discord between these English-speaking peoples. The world's future, it seems to me, depends for its brightness and glory on a union of all English-speaking nations in one great confederacy of Peace, as preliminary to that wider internationalism, of which the great-hearted poet-laureate has sung, "the parliament of man, the federation of the world." O, let us pray for it—let us work for it! Great is he who consecrates himself to such an idea. In order to possess greatness of character, we must be possessed by great ideas, great aims. We must ally ourselves to great causes. This is humanity's day. Small men in great places are at a discount. They have had their day. It has been a long, dark day. But the fountains of the great deep in human nature are being broken up, and the windows of Heaven are opening. The baptism of the Spirit can never narrow men. It can never divide those who receive it. It must unite them. In front of us men are born, or are to be born, who shall be great constructionists, great missionaries, great human-hearted statesmen, for whoever believes that "all power is given to our Lord Christ" inevitably believes in a great future for men.

—Reuen Thomas, The War System, pp. 3-30.

After all, we have overestimated the significance of the valor of the soldier. The hardest and highest triumphs are those won over prosperity, not over adversity; those which compel the resources of intelligence and wealth to serve the cause of humanity. Life is once and forever a battle, and there are no gains that come without a struggle.

The inspiration of the man with a musket is always inferior to the inspiration of the man with a principle. Women who in war days tore their garments into lint now dare not sacrifice a single napkin of the proprieties to bandage the mangled

spirits of those who go forth in search of truth and justice. Beautiful are the lives of those who decide that men must be free from the slavery of the body, but nobler are those who valorously wage the war against spiritual slavery and moral bondage.

"So he died for his faith. That is fine—
More than most of us do.
But stay, can you add to that line
That he lived for it, too?

"It is easy to die. Men have died
For a wish or a whim—
From bravado or passion or pride.
Was it harder for him?

"But to live; every day to live out
All the truth that he dreamt,
While his friends met his conduct with doubt
And the world with contempt—

"Was it thus that he plodded ahead,
Never turning aside?
Then we'll talk of the life that he led—
Never mind how he died."

—Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Peace, not War, the School of Heroism, in the Fourth American Peace Congress.

## CHAPTER XIII

## CHRIST THE ULTIMATE BASIS AND ASSURANCE OF PERMANENT INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL

As yet lingers the twelfth hour and the darkness; but the time will come when it shall be light, and man will awaken from his lofty dreams and find—his dreams all there and nothing gone save his sleep.

—Jean Paul Richter.

### THE CALL TO THE CHURCH

If we in this professedly Christian nation had been doing our whole duty as a Christian people, not merely in teaching and preaching, or in listening or subscribing to, but in practicing and obeying this religion of Jesus Christ, would there be any war in Europe to-day? But is that too much to ask of us, too much to expect of us? Possibly so. And yet it is the duty call and summons of the hour, the call which in this hour, this midnight hour, we hear—"Behold, the Bridegroom cometh!" It is not a time for despondency, it is not a time for despair, it is a time for resolute and hopeful action—"Behold, the Bridegroom cometh"; and confessing our sin and failure and that we have all slumbered and slept, but trimming now our lamps of faith and hope and love, let us go out to meet Him, that we may learn of Him to find and to walk in the way of love and peace; peace for ourselves, peace for the Church of God, peace for the fighting and warring nations; the way of love and peace. In the midnight darkness the cry is heard—"Behold, the Bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet Him!"

—David H. Greer, The Midnight Cry.

We have seen the love of a great Liberator and we also see that as we pass from the sacrificial love of a Saviour to the sacrificial duty of disciples of the Saviour we are building up ideals and social minds and social passions that shall answer problems of war and peace we shall never answer in terms of dollars and cents. It is indeed significant that the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, representing as it does something like thirty-two denominations and possibly sixteen million Protestant church members, has a commission on world peace and is endeavoring to create a state of peace. For what the world needs is not simply antimilitarism, but positive and helpful peace.

The mission of Christianity is not, "Thou shalt do things," but rather, "Thou shalt do those things which are embodied in the dramatic ideal set by the Founder of Christianity Himself." He dared to give His life to serve, He dared to work for others, He dared to sacrifice that others should have a peace that passes understanding. And when so-called Christian nations really become Christian nations, they will not go to arbitration courts simply to get what they can out of the decision. They will rather say, "Now, gentlemen, tell us what is right; tell us what is justice; and if your decision is against us we shall rejoice that justice is being done even though our claims are not met."

That is the ideal toward which we are moving. As we socialize this spirit of altruism that costs something, we shall legalize it, nationalize it, internationalize it. And we dare have this great hope, not as an academic, glittering generality, but as a conviction born of the observation of the past, born of a belief that the spiritual order is superior to the material order, born of the belief that God is in His world, and that God is the God of Love: a great hope that the time is coming when the real rather than the secondary Christianity shall rule men's planning; that the universal prayer is to be

answered that God's Kingdom shall come and that His will of love shall be done on earth as it is in heaven.

—Shailer Mathews, Christianity and World Peace, in the Reports of The Fourth American Congress, pp. 371, 372.

One thing seems certain. Not this nation or that, but the whole civilized world will ere long be forced to a decision between the ruinous worship of Force and the beneficent worship of God. Two Masters cannot be served forever. Two opposite opinions cannot be eternally maintained. The time comes when it is no longer possible to continue to keep both, and it is necessary to ally oneself with either one or the other. No compromise is possible between Christ and Nietzsche. Multitudes even now are mustering in the Valley of Decision. And before them lies the most momentous choice yet proposed in the course of the social evolution of the world. . . .

Let us turn to "the people"—the greatest army after all in every nation, because it is productive. Is their own outlook upon life likely to range these rulers of the future on the side of Peace or War? How will this enormous question, in Creighton's phrase, "strike their imagination"? The first step toward answering that, is to ask what already constitutes their ideal. Now I think it may be taken as an admitted truth that, speaking broadly, there are three essential elements of human life really dear to the people. Leaving aside for the moment the dignity of labor, the average working-class ideal seems to be compounded of these three ideas: Religion, Association, Liberty. Each of these elements is more than living, it is germinal; and that of which each contains the seed is not War but Peace. Consequently I regard their combined influence in the popular mind as of

cardinal importance in connection with the Peace movement in the world.

First, as to Religion. It is sometimes said that the great masses of mankind are irreligious. But they are not. It is not *they* who are opposed to the Christianity of Christ. Whether they go to church or not, they still "hear Him gladly." . . . Their regard for morality is intense: and they are never found belittling the Sermon on the Mount. If neglect of common worship leads many of them to miss the great idea of Fellowship inherent in Religion, they all believe in Association for practical purposes, and throughly understand its power. Moreover, this idea is conceived in a large and noble way which brooks no hampering national limits. Their Brotherhood movements, Cooperative Societies, Socialist Federations, Labor Unions, are all, more or less, international. Such organizations are educative. They prepare the way for that larger view of the world's life into which the limited patriotism, which was a virtue and a necessity in the past, is now in process of translation.

So with their love of liberty. That again refuses to be limited by considerations of race or clime. And even the spirit of nationalism, if it tends to isolate the gifts of freedom and progress from the universal life palpitating everywhere, will be rejected as inadequate. In the eyes of the people, separate nations will increasingly appear as the separate families of humanity. And even as no man can completely fulfill his duty as a father, who fails in the higher duty which he owes to his country; so no man can rightly fulfill his duties as a patriot, who fails in the higher duty which he owes to humanity.

—William Leighton Grane, The Passing of War, pp. 70-82. (The Macmillan Company, Publishers.)

We need to be taught that preparation for war is a heathen

way of insuring peace, and that the Christian method is to avoid war by removing causes of dispute. A Christian society may punish; it should never fight. This law is as true of industry as of politics. A world kept at peace by fear of strikes and lockouts is as hideous a caricature of Christendom as a world kept at peace through fear of armies.

As far as the church itself is concerned, the situation is a very simple one: the production of men who have the spirit of Christ and are ready to sacrifice privilege for the benefit of other people. And that means strong preaching. A religion which, no matter what its pious phrases, actually leads a man to hold fast to everything he possesses, whether it be money or advantage, has no right to call itself Christian. It is mere barbarism. Obey it and you will be following the medicine-man.

Conciliatory arbitration, with the accent upon the first word, is the practical contribution Christian men can make to the industrial situation. And Christians must make this contribution without fear of the contempt of those who prefer fighting to discussion; without fear of being called amateurs in practical affairs; without fear of anything except the rebuke of one's own conscience.

If the Golden Rule is inoperative outside pious books, let us be honest with ourselves and say so.

If reconciliation between men is less possible than reconciliation with God, let us say that also.

Only let us also not deceive ourselves in another particular. Let us be honest and label ourselves heathen.

—Shailer Mathews, The Making of To-Morrow, Extracts from pp. 103-105.

**THE CALL TO MINISTERS**

The doubt whether, as things are, all can be quite right

with normal Christian teachings seems fortified by the fact that, when the most up-to-date English dictionary refers to "Christianity," the last possible definition given is "conformity to the teachings of Christ in life and conduct," and this is ominously pronounced "Rare." Are we to fold our hands until we discover in the next edition that "Rare" has become "Obsolete"?

Surely we still have need to lay to heart the appeal by a great lay preacher of political righteousness, when he strove in 1853 to avert that war in the Crimea which was as immediately fertile in horrors as it afterward proved politically barren—

"You profess to be a Christian nation. You make it your boast that you are a people who draw your rule of doctrine and practice, as from a well pure and undefiled, from the living oracles of God. You have even conceived the magnificent project of illuminating the whole earth, even to its remotest and darkest recesses, by disseminating the volume of the New Testament, in whose every page are written forever the words of peace. Within the limits of this island alone, on every Sunday, in more than twenty thousand temples, devout men and women assemble that they may worship Him who is the 'Prince of Peace.' Is this a reality, or is your Christianity a romance, and your profession a dream? No, I am sure that your Christianity is not a romance, and I am equally sure that your profession is not a dream. It is because I believe this that I have hope and faith in the future. I believe that we shall see, and at no very distant time, sound economic principles spreading much more widely among the people; a sense of justice growing up in a soil which hitherto has been deemed unfruitful, and better than all, the churches of Britain awaking as it were from their slumbers, and girding up their loins to more glorious work, when they shall not only accept and believe in the prophecy, but labor earnestly

for its fulfillment, that there shall come a time—a time which shall last forever—when 'nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.' "

Now can we think that during the sixty years which have passed since those words were spoken, the "Churches of Britain" have "labored earnestly" in this direction? I am quite sure the Church of England has not. Among her multitudinous societies and organizations for every imaginable propaganda, no sort of association for promoting either the Peace of the World or any kind of peace ideal even existed till about 1910, and perhaps a hundred names would nearly exhaust its present membership. Too rarely has her voice been raised at all against the militarism which now more than ever oppresses Europe, and which dishonors and defies the Christianity we profess.

Let any one who has been accustomed for many years to listen to sermons try to recall even two or three occasions on which the possible prevention of war by Christian influences has been treated. He will, in all probability, find the topic untouched. . . . A simultaneous appeal such as is now annually made to thousands of conscientious people, if it could become universal over the whole Christian world, could hardly fail of considerable cumulative effect. . . . Perhaps nothing would do more to stir endeavor in the right direction than a real conviction that "Peace on earth" is not an angel-song, or merely a crank's quixotic dream, but a real, definite, practicable possibility. And is it not so? In 1780 Benjamin Franklin wrote, "We make great improvements in natural, there is one I wish to see in moral, philosophy; the discovery of a plan which would induce and oblige nations to settle their disputes without first cutting one another's throats. When will human reason be sufficiently improved to see the advantage of this?" Commenting on this (in a leading article inspired by Mr. Andrew Carnegie's munificent gift

in the cause of peace) the *Times* recently observed: "After the lapse of one hundred and thirty years human reason is manifestly not yet sufficiently improved to see it. We must still sorrowfully say, with Joubert, 'Force is the Right which rules everything in the world; Right waits upon Force.' Force is still waiting until Right is ready to achieve its perfect work; and to all appearance it will still have many a long day to wait."

I am bold to put among our grounds of Hope language even such as this, from such a source. The *Times* leader-writer is at least sorrowful about his verdict, and he does not dismiss Franklin's ideal as absurd, but only as likely to be long delayed. Indeed he goes on to say that "it would be well worth the while of the nations to lay down their tens of millions of pounds for each of the two just given by Mr. Carnegie (to hasten the abolition of international war) if by so doing they could get rid of the crushing and ever-growing burden of their armaments. But could they? Franklin yearned for a plan which could induce and oblige nations to settle their disputes without first cutting one another's throats. But where is the obligation—or sanction as jurists call it—to come from?

This question, we must all agree, "touches the spot." And we shall all be as hopeless as the *Times,* if we think it unanswerable. But I venture to submit that it is not. No one who gives due weight to the opinions of psychologists most qualified to judge, no one who recognizes the leading factor in such advances in social evolution as have already been made, can be anything but confident that the "sanction" and "obligation" of which the leader-writer despairs, can be, and will be, found in a further developed moral sense among the peoples of the earth. . . .

If the clergy hold commission from Him who came "not to destroy men's lives but to save them," how can they fulfill

it without doing all that in them lies to elevate the public sentiment in this tremendous affair? Ought they not to feel "straitened" until something further is accomplished, and the nations, instead of spending and being spent in "making provision" to bite and devour one another, are enlisted in a holy army and launched on a new crusade for the unifying and compacting of the common civilization, and for an organized international rescue of the still desecrated Temple of Peace. For this—this *novum salutis genus* indeed —the old war-cry may well be raised again, and with infinitely greater truth: *Deus vult! Dieu le veult!* God wills it!

—W. L. Grane, The Passing of War, Extracts from pp. 165-174. (The Macmillan Co., Publishers.)

The next great forward step for the Christian world is the Crusade for Peace. Who shall be the leaders in this forward movement of the modern world?

*Pastors, awake!* Enlist in the new crusade! *Yours is the great opportunity: yours the splendid responsibility.* The suffering war-sick world awaits your response to the call of the Prince of Peace.

Under enthusiastic guidance by the pastors of America 100,000 strong, the Christian forces can easily be mobilized for the New Crusade, the war against war. Vast campaigns are before us. Ballots shall be our bullets. Legislatures must be captured. Golden Rule laws must be enacted by national and State legislatures.

The Prince of Peace invites volunteers for the New Crusade.

—Sidney L. Gulick, The Fight for Peace, p. 191.

Upon these 700,000 ministers of the Gospel rests a peculiarly solemn responsibility for the peace of the world. They are, of all men, best acquainted with the teaching of Jesus,

and it is their sole business in life to enforce that teaching. Granted that they do not agree on the question whether the Gospel *ever* sanctions war, they must agree, if they read the Gospel intelligently and without the fear of man, that Jesus laid supreme emphasis on the attainment of qualities of character which render war increasingly impossible, and they must agree that the spirit of Jesus would try every suggestion of brotherly love before it would even consider a resort to the "dread arbitrament of war."

—George Holley Gilbert, The Bible and Universal Peace, pp. 202-204.

The striking chapter on "The Moral Supremacy of Christendom" with which the editor of *The Hibbert Journal* closes his recent book, *The Alchemy of Thought*, should be digested by the clergy. If Christianity is so taught in the West that neither the Christian ideal, nor even the "Gothic qualities" of chivalry and honor are generally operative, while other faiths are producing higher policy and better lives, Christendom is challenged indeed. To the man whose eyes are open, the broad outlines of any policy of blood and iron, from the story of British colonial expansion—however splendidly compensated by subsequent administration—down to the Italian descent on Tripoli—however blessed by Princes of the church—have really "as little to do with chivalry and honor as with the Sermon on the Mount."

—William Leighton Grane, The Passing of War, Extract from p. 120. (The Macmillan Company, Publishers.)

One of the beautiful pictures adorning the dome of a church in Rome, by that master of art, whose immortal colors speak as with the voice of a poet, the divine Raphael, represents Mars in the attitude of War, with a drawn sword

uplifted and ready to strike, while an unarmed angel from behind, with gentle, but irresistible force, arrests and holds the descending hand. Such is the true image of Christian duty; nor can I readily perceive any difference in principle between those ministers of the Gospel who themselves gird on the sword, as in the olden time, and those others, unarmed, and in customary suit of solemn black, who lend the sanction of their presence to the martial array, or to any form of preparation for war. The drummer who pleaded that he did not fight, was held more responsible for the battle than the soldier—as it was the sound of his drum that inflamed the flagging courage of the troops.

—Charles Sumner, Addresses on War, p. 60.

Let us hear more of the inherent senselessness of war, and less of the inherent right of a nation to make war. Let us hear less and less of the so-called justifiable nature of war, the purifying influence of war, the heroic sacrifices made in war; let us be unsparing in denunciation of the selfish motives that lead to war. Let us regard as a flagrant contradiction in terms such phrases as a "war of progress," "the judicial character of war," "the lawful place of war in the world," "the sacred and serious object of war," "the morality of war," "the solemnizing type of character produced by war"; and let us stoutly maintain that no function, however serious and sacred, can "consecrate" war. Let us cease to preach that war, as such, can be "elevated"—even by "sacrifice." Lastly, let us refuse to concede in any given case the "necessity of war."

—E. S. Roberts, Quoted in The Passing of War, p. 168.

**THE BIBLE AND PEACE**

To measure accurately the part which the Bible has had

in the creation and development of the desire and purpose to substitute peace for war, and in the establishment of institutions whose aim is to realize that desire and purpose, would of course be an impossible task. The Bible has been the main source of religious direction and inspiration for all Christian peoples, and religion has always been, as it still is, the deepest spring of human progress. But the connection between the Bible and specific stages of progress is often indirect and hidden, the more so as the distance between the living present and the Bible widens. While countless deeds are daily wrought for righteousness by those who are perfectly conscious that their best life is rooted in the Gospel, it is also true that countless good influences are daily set in motion or fostered by men and women who are *not* aware that the spirit of their lives is a heritage from the Bible, and indeed it is not, in multitudes of cases.

But though it is impossible perfectly to disentangle the strands of the Bible's influence for peace from other influences working toward that end, we may, nevertheless, hope to form an approximately correct view of their strength, and even that task seems well worth the doing.

It is to be admitted, of course, at the outset that the Bible has promoted war as well as peace, that it has furnished the quiver of the stout fighter not less abundantly than that of the friend of peace. We shall not attempt to show how widely and deeply the Bible has stimulated war either by its picture of a warlike Yahweh, or through various texts and incidents in Old Testament history, or through the misinterpretation of certain New Testament passages. The man who has had it in his heart and in the power of his hand to torment or kill his adversary has never been long at a loss to find justification in Scripture, if indeed he has sought it. As in the name of liberty some of the worst crimes against her spirit have been perpetrated, so in the name of God

and the Bible men have often plunged wildly into the nethermost abysses of savage war.

And yet, while making this admission, we hold it true that the growth of the sentiment and institutions of peace—a growth that implies a corresponding decline of the war-spirit—is traceable in a considerable degree to the Bible, the same Bible that has sometimes fed the destroying flames of war, but that Bible better understood.

There is, indeed, a large element of truth in the assertion that all Jewish history—meaning by that phrase Old Testament history—is a narrative of wars, but the statement that these wars—some of them defensive and with apparent good ground, as Gideon's campaign against the Midianites, and others offensive and destitute of any manifest justification, as the war of extermination against the Amalekites—were all waged under the personal direction of the Lord, is a statement before which the moral sense of a Christian ought to shrink back with horror. If the "Lord of hosts" was the God of Jesus, then it is obvious that he never commanded that women and little children should be put to the sword, because their ancestors, two hundred years before, had done an injury to Israel; obvious, also, that He did not inspire the fratricidal wars between Judah and the northern tribes, which were sometimes wars of revenge, of greed, and of ambition. These wars were no better, and perhaps no worse, than the wars waged in those generations outside of Palestine, and to say that they were waged under the direction of the Lord of hosts is to concede that this Lord of hosts was of a wholly different spirit from the God of Jesus and the Gospel. . . .

Christian people ought at last to agree that an appeal to any Scripture whose spirit is foreign to the spirit of Jesus is a most dangerous perversion of the Bible.

—George Holley Gilbert, The Bible and Universal Peace, pp. 161-163.

## THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CHURCH

His name shall be called the Prince of Peace, and yet what terrible mockery has been offered to that name by His avowed followers! It is one of the ironies of history that the most costly and deadly armaments for the killing of men in war are being wrought out in cold steel to-day not by the nations which owe their allegiance to Mahomet, the Prophet of the Sword, but by those nations which profess allegiance to the Prince of Peace. "Put up thy sword," He said twenty centuries ago! The command has never been withdrawn nor revoked. And yet look out across the face of what we call Christendom and see the wicked and costly refusal!

Christian Germany, where the Protestant Reformation was ushered in by the preaching of Martin Luther, has increased her national debt in a single generation from eighteen millions of dollars to over one thousand millions, chiefly by expenditures upon her army and navy. Christian England, known to the ends of the earth as a center of missionary impulse, is almost beside herself in her mad desire to increase the number of "dreadnoughts." She is spending three hundred millions of dollars a year on her army and navy as against eighty-two millions all told on education, science, and art. Christian Russia, professing in her Orthodox Greek Church to have the only true faith to be found upon the globe, is planning a billion-dollar navy and is actually spending two hundred millions a year upon armaments as against twenty-two millions a year upon education. And our Christian country has been making a strange and sad departure from that policy which has made us prosperous and happy, honored and useful among the nations of the earth for more than one hundred years. The United States has increased in population within the last ten years ten per cent and it has increased its military expenditures during that period by three hundred per cent. And this is Christendom! These are the nations

which look up to the One whose name is called "The Prince of Peace" and crown him Lord of all! Alas! for the terrible and bitter irony of such a course!

And all this at a time when the bare problem of bread is becoming more and more serious. England spending her three hundred millions of dollars a year on military outlay has little children in the streets of London and Glasgow eating refuse out of the swill tubs and garbage barrels because they are hungry. The problem of poverty and unemployment there is so grave that the British Parliament sets aside whole days for its consideration. In Germany a government expert said recently that according to carefully prepared estimates based upon detailed investigation there were two men applying for every job which promised a living wage—one half of the skilled and effective labor of the empire was out of employment. In Russia people by the thousand die like flies from malnutrition at the very hour when her military experts are talking about the billion-dollar navy. It is nothing less than criminal thus to take the children's bread and fling it to the dogs of war! How terrible all this is for nations which profess to honor and follow the One who came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them!

And in our own country while the situation is less serious there are men enough, God knows, out of work and unable to find bread to put into the mouths of their families. Our national leaders are looking in every direction to discover how the revenue may be increased. The revenue to-day is sadly inadequate for the things which ought to be done. There are millions of acres of arid land to be irrigated by national enterprise and offered for settlement to industrious families. There are great areas of swamp land to be drained which would support a busy, happy population. There are forests to be conserved and renewed in a way that would change the whole face of the situation for the farmer and the

fruit grower in great sections of our country. There are inland waterways to be improved and developed, bringing producer and consumer nearer together by better means of transportation, thus reducing the cost of living. There is a merchant marine sadly needing assistance in order that our flag might fly on all seas and in every port, thus making possible a useful and profitable trade. All these things ought to be done at once if there was only money to do them. All these interests of life suffer and lag for lack of money in the very period when within ten years we are increasing our military expenditures by three hundred per cent. His name shall be called "The Prince of Peace" and it is under His banner that we profess to march! . . .

Has not the time come for the plain people to call a halt! Has not the time come for the indignant toilers in peaceful occupations to hurl those mischief-makers who are responsible for this craze of militarism out of their positions of influence! Has not the solemn and ugly farce of seeing Christian nations build ten million-dollar bulldogs in the remote possibility of being called upon to match them against the costly bulldogs of their neighbors, unless perchance these expensive creations should before that have been relegated to the scrapheap by some new device—has not that solemn, ugly farce about played itself out? The welfare of the people is the supreme law of all lands and anyone who has visited Europe, where every third peasant carries a useless and burdensome soldier on his back as he goes forth to his toil, knows that this modern evil of militarism is a mighty menace to the welfare of any people.

—Charles R. Brown, The Prince of Peace,
Extracts from pp. 3-24.

What are the churches doing—what in particular is the church of England doing—to help the fulfillment of her

prayer for the gift to all nations of unity, peace, and concord?

In her best and greatest days the church has been a great emancipating power. . . . But it is the mission of the church not only to set men free but to bind and hold them together. She has banished, or helped to banish, many of the social plagues which used to poison and devastate human life. She may still, if she will—using her opportunities and living up to the height of her mandate—take her share in expelling the greatest scourge which still threatens the unity and progress of mankind.

—H. H. Asquith, as quoted in The Passing of War, Extract from p. 126.

A church filled with a contagious faith in the God of things as they are becoming, that seeks first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, that stirs men to moral discontent, in order that they may be brought into sacrificial service, through fellowship with their crucified Lord, that bases the demand for human fraternity upon the experience of divine sonship—such a church is the veritable servant of the living God.

—Shailer Mathews.

Seldom in the history of the Christian Church has there been opened to her a more superb opportunity to serve mankind than that now calling her to reenforce and carry forward this movement in the interests of the world's peace. Even should there be among her ministers or her members those still prepared, under certain conditions, to justify war, yet no man fit to be called a Christian can refuse for an instant to admit the obligation we are under to avert the horrors of war, if it be possible, by arbitration. If war must be, then

let it be only after the last possible means has been exhausted that could have saved so dread and desolating a calamity.

There are three ways at least in which the churches can add to the power and momentum of the movement this Conference represents: First, their ministers and their teachers, with their rare opportunities to reach the generation of to-day and the generation that shall be to-morrow, can make clear the real meaning and purpose of arbitration. Just what this word embodies in the language and discussion of our time multitudes do not know. And what arbitration has already accomplished in averting war, in cultivating a kindlier international spirit, in revealing the possibilities along the path toward which it points, here our churches should be the instructors of their people. Few nobler themes can demand attention at the hands of the Christian ministry than the significance of such gatherings as those at The Hague. What those historic assemblies in the name of peace have actually achieved in deepening the desire of the nations to live together as friends and not as foes, it is time the people in our churches were led to understand. Too widely prevails the idea that it is folly to expect governments to act save in their own selfish interests. Again and again the claim is made, that, however individuals in a nation might be willing to do the righteous thing for the sake of peace and good-will, in their united capacity as a government, they can never be counted on to see any good higher than their own aggrandizement. It was the late Prime Minister of Great Britain who said, "The bonds of mutual understanding and esteem are strengthening between the peoples"; and Mr. Root has recently told us that this growing sense of the right relations that should exist between nations is influencing them "in countless cases to shape their own conduct against their own apparent interests." Utterances like these, made by the leading statesmen of the world, are growing significantly common.

The very knowledge of this, clearly in the minds of the people of our churches, would predispose them to larger hope as to the outcome of friendly conference.

All this, as a vital part of that broader world-view that is characterizing our time, the people of our churches should know. In opposition to the reiterated declarations that the Hague Conferences have proved failures, that arbitration is impracticable, that nations may not be expected to treat each other as sane and honorable men may do, let the churches, through their ministers, set the actual facts, and so become persistent, intelligent educational centers training the men and women of to-day and to-morrow into enthusiastic friends of arbitration.

Second, the churches, through their ministers and teachers, may aid the movement for the world's peace by laying upon the hearts of their people what has been so well called "the moral damage of war." I may not plead here against all war. I am not asked to free my soul with respect to the question whether anything but evil may be hoped for from such an inferno into which men plunge when they strike for each others' throats in the wild carnage of war. But here I may plead with those who stand as leaders in the world's great moral conflict to open to all who will read it the book that tells the story of the moral relapse a nation suffers when it resolves to stain its hands with blood, and of the inhuman and degrading passions that are unleashed in the breasts of those who go forth to do a nation's fighting. Here, silence on the part of the church is treason against her Lord. . . .

Third, the churches can do more than any other forms of organized activity toward advancing the cause of peace and arbitration by the fuller declaration of those principles of the Christian faith that should determine the relation every man should sustain toward his neighbor, whether that neighbor live across the street or across the sea, and whether he be

white or black, or red or yellow. Let us not mistake. Education may do much for peace; the representatives of commerce may do much to abolish war; appeals to selfish interests may be made, and not in vain; but the Spirit incarnate in Him we call the Prince of Peace, this, and this alone, is the power unwearying and undying that can lift us as a nation to that high level where war will be tolerated no more. If half the time that has been spent defending theological and sectarian positions had been devoted to the teaching of those truths in the light of which, by the very charter of the church, men must learn to know themselves as members of one great family, bound by the sacredest of obligations to feel toward their fellows of every land and clime as brothers, a thousand wars "that have stained the world incarnadine," could never have been.

—Francis H. Rowley, The Ability and Duty of the Churches to Aid the Arbitration and Peace Movement; in Reports of Lake Mohonk Conference, 1908, pp. 160-162.

Such times are opportune for asking whether Christendom has discharged its obligation to its Lord of denominating Him, through its pulpits on the occasion of their annual Christmas sermons, the Prince of Peace, or whether it be at last possible to do the things that He says, gathering new interpretations out of the Hill Sermon, and giving them new applications.

Christian morality is the touchstone to which war must now be brought; for if it cannot justify itself to the modern Christ, it surely cannot any longer command the approbation of modern Christendom. Reference to ancient texts and traditions may help certain minds, and may have brought us part of the way; but it is surely now possible to take our stand upon the historical development of the Christian conscious-

ness, and claim that it demands the substitution of reason for violence, and the triumph of moral over physical forces.

—Walter Walsh, Moral Damage of War, p. 4.

It cannot be gainsaid that up to the present day the church has failed, grievously failed, to stand with Jesus for peace. What is to be its record in the years before us? It holds in Christendom the balance of power between war and peace. One may safely go further, and say that the *clergy* hold this balance of power. For, consider their influence a moment. The clergy of the United States number approximately 175,000, and there are, perhaps, about three times as many in Europe, exclusive of Russia—700,000 in all. These men as a class have that authority which flows from a thorough education; they have the prestige of representing a religion that has surpassed all others in its power to uplift humanity, and they have the unique personal influence that springs from a ministry to men in the vital matters of the soul, and in the most sacred events of the outward life. These 700,000 Christian ministers have an opportunity to determine the ideals of perhaps twenty millions of boys and girls whom they have consecrated to the God of peace in baptism.

Moreover, this great host of ministers who are pledged to preach the Gospel would have, in the advocacy of peace, almost the unanimous support of the women of the church, probably not less than fifty millions, as well as the support of a majority of those women of Christian lands who are not in the church, and they would also be upheld by a number of men within the church which, if not as large as the number of women, would, nevertheless, be many times as large as the army of Xerxes, while a multitude of men outside the church are ready for a leadership of peace.

*The church must educate its members.* I do not know what your experience is, but mine has been that the organized

Christian communities, with the honorable exception of the Society of Friends, have not even among their own members emphasized as they should the ethical character of Christian teaching generally and certainly not in relation to war and the use of force. Therefore, the first duty of the church is to impress the Christian ideal on the minds and hearts of Christians so that they believe in it, not as something remote, in the clouds, or for a different world than this, but as the one and only ideal workable in this world if men will but accept it and act on it. . . .

*The church must educate the nation.* The Christian church is not coextensive with any nation. We must recognize that fact. Nevertheless, the influence of the Christian church extends beyond its membership and plays an important part in forming the conscience of the community, influencing public opinion and approximating it to the Christian ideal. It should therefore be part of the definite policy of the church to educate public opinion by earnestly contending for the faith and by making it clear that she stands for the supremacy of moral considerations. . . .

*The Christian churches in the different nations must organize* for the promotion of more fraternal relations and for combating those misunderstandings which are the result of ignorance, or due to the misrepresentations of those who in the press stir up ill will, inflame passion, and endanger the peace of the world.

—W. Moore Ede, The Part of the Christian Church in Relation to Peace, in Reports of the Lake Mohonk Conference, 1911, pp. 141, 142.

Topics about which the masses are to be instructed. Suggested by Samuel T. Dutton at the Third American Peace Congress, 1911.

The relation of Christianity to peace.

The duty of all churches and the clergy.

The philanthropic aspects of progress toward peace.

A comparison of the twentieth century with the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth as to war and its decadence.

Ancient and modern forms of heroism and the fallacies regarding the necessity of war as a moral tonic.

The financial, economic, and educational restraints upon the war spirit.

The relation of war scares to original sin and pure cussedness.

The justification of wage-earners and socialists in demanding that governments agree to the judicial settlement of all disputes.

The need of peace commissions in every country working separately and collectively to arrange the new order.

The need of a thorough reorganization of the peace forces of the United States under the advice of a representative national council.

The propriety of asking the United States government, which spent in the year 1910 $443,000,000 for war and pensions, to appropriate annually $1,000,000 for peace, to be expended by a commission appointed by the President.

This is only adding the touch of practicality and of sincerity to those memorable words spoken by Mr. Roosevelt at Christiania:

"Granted sincerity of purpose, the great Powers of the world should find no insurmountable difficulty in reaching an agreement which would put an end to the present costly and growing extravagance of expenditure on naval armaments and it would be a master stroke if those great Powers honestly bent on peace would form a League of Peace."

—In Report of Congress Proceedings, p. 341.

The Church has a responsibility to see to it that there

be a *Christian* State. While she must avoid politics as such, yet her voice should be heard upon the moral aspect of public questions. And her testimony should ring out sharp and clear against policies which injure the public welfare and trample upon the essential principles and maxims of morality and religion.

It is on these grounds that the church has a special mission with respect to *war.* War is a resort to physical force to adjust the differences between nations. This method, as between individuals, the church, by its infusion of Christian ethics, has banished, as belonging to the sphere of barbarism, and none the less does the church place war (as between nations) in the same category.

Now, at the present juncture, we find ourselves confronted by two ideals, in direct opposition. One is that of what we may call *the world-empire spirit.* The several races of men, separated partially by blood, by language, historical traditions and national boundaries, look upon each other as rivals, and seek the leadership, to one another's hurt, with a great ambition to wield the scepter over the world. . . .

Opposed to this ideal, so largely ruling the State in all history, and unexpectedly coming to the front at present, as dominant in Europe, is the *Christian ideal*—that of the church. . . .

It is clear as the light of the sun that there can be no agreement between these two ideals. They are as far apart, and as direct opposites, as the poles. One means Selfishness, the other Charity. One means Love, the other Hate. One means Peace, the other War. War is antagonistic to Christianity for many reasons, but chiefly on account of the ugly passions it excites, and the untold misery it inflicts, and that upon those almost wholly if not altogether innocent of bringing it about.

—Junius B. Remensnyder, The Church's Mission as to War and Peace.

It is quite possible that we have committed the time-honored folly of looking for a sudden change in men's attitude toward war, even as the poor alchemists wasted their lives in searching for a magic fluid and did nothing to discover the great laws governing chemical changes and reactions, the knowledge of which would have developed untold wealth beyond their crude dreams of transmuted gold.

The final moral reaction may at last come accompanied by deep remorse, too tardy to reclaim all the human life which has been spent and the treasure which has been wasted, or it may come with a great sense of joy that all voluntary destruction of human life, all the deliberate wasting of the fruits of labor, have become a thing of the past, and that whatever the future contains for us, it will at least be free from war. . . . That this world peace movement should be arising from the humblest without the sanction and in some cases with the explicit indifference of the church founded by the Prince of Peace, is simply another example of the strange paths of moral evolution.

—Jane Addams, Newer Ideals of Peace, pp. 234, 235.
(The Macmillan Company, Publishers.)

Reason is for us, for war is an outrage upon reason. Justice is for us, for war tramples justice underfoot. Civilization is for us, for war is the incarnation of barbarism. Above all religion is for us, for we have the benediction of Him who has said, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the sons of God."

—Henry Richards, as quoted in The Passing of War, p. 283.

The churches must see to it that the peoples of Europe are reorganized on the sure basis of an abiding peace. Our business is to get the ideals of Christ realized in the new map of Europe. The States of Europe, great and small, first, and

finally on the foundation of international agreement, with just international laws, with an International Court to administer the laws, and an International Police to execute the laws. That is our goal. The vision of Kant, in his Everlasting Peace, must guide us. A common understanding among the peoples of Europe, an acceptance of methods of unified compulsion, carried out by an international police, against a criminal State, compelling it, by blockade or by boycott, to accept the verdict of the International Tribunal, just as individuals within a State or a municipality are compelled to abide by the law of the Nation or the State.

Further, ought not the churches of the Son of Man to make it their business to see that the European populations shall be set free from the concerted dictation and tyranny of the "Powers"—that is, of twenty or thirty individuals, most of whom are bound up with or swayed by military ideas? Must we not do our best to give the different peoples of Europe time, opportunity, and means to decide for themselves how they wish to be governed? Why should not the Albanians be encouraged to shape their own political future? Why may not the three divisions of ancient Poland say for themselves whether they wish to be united together under the rule of Russia, or to become a Republic, to enthrone a Constitutional King or create a Swiss Confederation? Should not the churches do all that is possible to realize the highest ideals of individual and social well-being in the reconstruction that must follow when the blare of the war-trumpets and the din of the war-drums are heard no longer?

—John Clifford, The War and the Churches.

## THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH IN RELATION TO PEACE

As in the New Testament, so in the earliest subapostolic writings that have come down to us, the question of Christians taking part in war or becoming soldiers is never discussed.

Roughly speaking, we may divide the history of the early church into three periods in respect of the attitude of Christians to the military profession.

Period I. The primitive church till about the time of Irenaeus (circa 200 A. D.).

During this period the church disapproved of war and Christians were conspicuous by refusing to become soldiers.

Period II. From 200 to about 313.

During this period church writers protested strongly against Christians being in the army, but some were in it.

Period III. After Constantine (313 onward).

The church was allied with the empire, and could no longer maintain her protest against war. Christians were increasingly to be found in the army, and in general they do not seem to have been severely blamed for it; yet, for a time, an undercurrent of protest is still apparent. . . .

Up to the beginning of the fourth century the most important fathers of the church had maintained a protest against Christians taking part in war. From this time onward, though here and there a prominent ecclesiastic voiced a similar protest, Christians generally became increasingly entangled in worldly affairs and began to lose the sense of antagonism between Christ and militarism, which had hitherto restrained them from participation in war. Of course the church stood for peaceful in preference to warlike methods, as she stood for a milder and more humane standard in every department of life. . . .

In the Middle Ages the Catharists and the Waldenses opposed war and capital punishment, taking literally the command, "Thou shalt not kill." They endeavored to make the Gospels the rule of their lives, and therefore naturally saw the chief fruit of religion in practical goodness. . . .

The Fransciscan movement of the thirteenth century was in many respects similar to the foregoing. It was an attempt

to return to gospel standards of life and conduct. In one thing, however, it differed from these earlier movements in that it was retained within the church.

The Fransciscan friars rapidly became a great power in Christendom, first of all following the ideal of their founder as preachers, in later times as theologians. But Francis had desires for spiritual religion which could not be fulfilled by those alone who deserted house and property for the sake of the Gospel; he formed also an association of laymen and women who were in the ordinary workaday life of the world to practice the Gospel teaching of love and goodness. These were known as Tertiaries. Numbers of earnest men and women thronged into the new order, and its effect on international life was widely felt, for its members were forbidden to bear arms at all, and in consequence princes experienced difficulty in waging war.

Thus the protest against Christians taking part in war comes up again *within* the church.

Yet how little influence such peace ideals had on the church as a whole may be gathered from the fact that Wycliffe more than a century later could write: "Friars now say that bishops can fight best of all men, and that it falleth most properly to them, since they are lords of all this world. They say, Christ bade his disciples sell their coats, and buy them swords; but whereto, if not to fight? Thus friars make a great array, and stir up men to fight. But Christ taught not his apostles to fight with the sword of iron, but with the sword of God's word, which standeth in meekness of heart and in the prudence of man's tongue. . . . If manslaying in others be odious to God, much more in priests who should be vicars of Christ." From this extract from Wycliffe's writings we may gather two facts of importance to our investigation:

(1) That in the Middle Ages clergymen actually themselves took part in warfare. This, startling though it is to us,

is an undoubted fact. We hear of bishops who, like secular princes, led their retainers to battle in person, and even boasted of the numbers they had slain with their own hands. That they were not wholly without sense of the incompatibility of such conduct with their profession is seen by the fact that their weapon was generally a mace or club, with which they could kill an adversary *without shedding his blood.*

(2) Secondly, it is clear from the way in which Wycliffe here speaks of war that he believed it to be unlawful for a Christian.

In this he was followed by some of the Lollards, whose teaching was very definite: "Men of warre are not allowed by the Gospel, the Gospel knoweth peace and not warre." . . .

From the labors of Peter of Chelcic sprang the movement which later developed into the Moravian Church, a church which, like the Society of Friends, has all through its existence maintained a protest against all war. In the most desperate straits the early Moravian brethren never defended themselves. "No weapon did they use except the pen. They never retaliated, never rebelled, never took up arms in their own defense, never even appealed to the arm of justice. When smitten on one cheek, they turned the other." . . . The mention of the Moravian Church brings us to the very threshold of the Reformation.

At that great epoch, when men's minds were intent on restoring the purity of the Church of Christ, the question of war came very prominently to the front. Luther himself in the earlier part of his career was so opposed to war that Sir Thomas More could charge him with carrying the doctrines of peace to the extreme limits of non-resistance. Unfortunately he in later life countenanced the bloody suppression of the Peasants' Revolt, so that he cannot be quoted as a consistent opponent of all war.

Erasmus also wrote very strongly on the subject: "If there

be anything in the affairs of mortals, which it is in the interests of men not only to attack, but which ought by every possible means be avoided, condemned, and abolished, it is of all things war, than which nothing is more impious, more calamitous, more widely pernicious, more inveterate, more base, or in sum more unworthy of a man, not to say of a Christian."

—WILLIAM E. WILSON, Christ and War, pp. 75-81.

**RESOLUTIONS OF CHURCHES**

The National Unitarian Conference, at its session in Buffalo, in October, 1913, adopted unanimously the following resolutions, emphasizing anew the duty of all the churches to support earnestly the movement for international justice and friendship:

*"Whereas,* The existence of war as a means of settling disputes between nations is a relic of barbarism, and it should be the work of all churches professing a belief in the teachings of Christ to abolish war,

*"Resolved,* That this Conference of Unitarian and other Christian Churches does hereby strongly recommend that each church belonging to it should, through its social service committee or a specially appointed peace committee of men and women, keep the congregation informed regarding the peace movement. It should cooperate with any local peace society and similar peace committees appointed by other local churches, to the end that public opinion in their respective communities may be aroused."

The National Congregational Council, meeting in Kansas City in October, immediately after the Unitarian Conference at Buffalo, adopted similarly the following strong declaration, urging all the churches of that great body to resolute and systematic service in the war against war and the present monstrous armaments of the nations:

"The Congregational Churches of the United States, confessing anew their allegiance to the Prince of Peace, and desirous of making the Christian Church the foremost peacemaker of the world, desire to place on record their disapproval of the present rivalry of Christian nations in creating colossal armies and navies, and to declare themselves the unflinching antagonists of all who by word or deed fan the flames of racial prejudice or disseminate the seeds of international ill will.

"Believing that our Republic both by situation and tradition is peculiarly fitted to lead the nations into the paths of peace, we appeal to our President and Congress to call a halt in the swelling expenditures for the paraphernalia of war, and exhort our pastors and teachers to keep before the public mind the evils and perils of militarism, to explain and defend the cause of arbitration, and to work in season and out of season for the advancement of world-wide brotherhood."

In connection with this significant action by these two national conferences, it is important to remember that the Federal Council of Churches, representing more than twenty of the religious denominations of the United States, has its special peace department, which has already instituted important activities and is constantly broadening its work. It arranged for addresses in thirty thousand churches in support of President Taft's arbitration treaties. An illustration of what may be done by the churches of a single city is afforded by Buffalo, N. Y., where more than twenty of the leading churches of the city have affiliated with the local peace society, each church appointing its special peace committee of five members, which committees are cooperating heartily to promote the peace movement. A similar organization should be effected by the churches in all the cities of the country, to arrange union meetings, to spread peace literature, and to bring public opinion to bear upon Congress. The World

Peace Foundation desires to cooperate with every such organization in every possible way.

—The Churches and the Peace Movement,
World Peace Foundation Publication.

**THE SONG OF PEACE**

Forward, all ye faithful,
Seeking love and peace,
Hast'ning on the era
When all strife shall cease.
All the saintly sages,
Lead us in the way;
Forward in their footsteps,
Toward that perfect day.

Raise the voice of triumph,
"Peace on earth, good-will."
Angels sang this anthem,
Let us sing it still.
War's foundations quiver,
At this song of peace.
Brothers, let us sing it,
Till all strife shall cease!

Children of one Father,
Are the nations all;
"Children mine beloved"
Each one doth he call.
Be ye not divided,
All one family;
One in mind and spirit
And in charity.

Wealth and power shall perish,
Nations rise and wane;
Love of others only
Steadfast will remain.
Hate and greed can never
'Gainst this Love prevail;
It shall stand triumphant
When all else shall fail.

—Martin K. Schermerhorn.

# INTERNATIONAL PEACE

## A Study in Christian Fraternity

**A Course of Thirteen Lessons Prepared for the Commission on Christian Education of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, Cooperating with the Church Peace Union**

# AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE STUDIES

The form of the material presented in the following studies has been adopted with the view of helping those adults who are interested in the subject and who desire to think their way through it to arrive at some satisfactory conclusions. A great spiritual emergency has arisen in the history of the human race. Events that are both humiliating and alarming have forced seriously minded people to consider the conditions of permanent international goodwill. A new world-problem has been created and the future welfare of the race depends upon its being solved. In the Providence of God it seems to be the duty of those people who are not now engaged in war, and who can approach the question with a calm mind, to try to find out upon what permanent basis inter-racial tranquillity can be established.

In taking up what seem to be the most vital aspects of the problem, it is seen that people living in Bible times were brought face to face with conditions which, in many respects, are similar to those of the present day. Under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, they arrived at certain conclusions. Inspired writers put into permanent form ideas that resulted from these ancient experiences. It would be folly to try to think one's way through the present problems without going to the Bible for its message. The substantial finality of the principles of human brotherhood as presented in the sacred Scriptures makes them the most valuable source of study material. Hence, Bible study, in this sense, has been kept in the foreground throughout the series.

But the study has not been confined to the Bible. There are factors involved in the present situation that need to be understood. Some of the forces now at work are new and they must be reckoned with. The truths of the Word of God need to be studied in the light of the twentieth century state of affairs. To ignore the facts and events included in the present commercial, social, and political situation would be to leave the problem unsolved. In the endeavor to arrive at conclusions that are even partially satisfactory, it is necessary to study present-day world conditions in the light of the Bible, and also to study the Bible in the light of these conditions.

The problem of interracial good will is ultimately a religious problem. The bonds of world-wide fraternity must have some content and sanction that go beyond the range of economic interdependence and the practical advantages of commercial cooperation. In the hour of intense passion, prudential considerations are laid aside. Interracial morality is as dependent upon religion for its stability as is the morality of individuals.

The universal bonds of brotherhood receive their real meaning in the light of the origin and the destiny of the race. And these are not simply biological questions. They are religious.

It has not been the author's purpose to follow out all of the implications of the truths presented. No attempt has been made to make an exhaustive study of the problem at hand. Questions have been raised and purposely left unanswered. It is hoped that each one who studies the lessons will give independent consideration to the various subjects presented. The class discussions will bring out many points of view not contained in the printed lesson. Each one should strive seriously to arrive at his own reason for belief in the ultimate and permanent tranquillity of the nations.

In order to stimulate worth-while discussion among the members of the class, questions have been introduced at appropriate places in the lesson material. It is believed that this will be one of the most valuable features of the course. It is expected that points of view that are not contained in the printed material will be brought out. But the leader of the class should have a care lest the discussion drift away from the main point. He should guide it. It is especially urged that no ardent and partisan advocate of either side in the present war be permitted to interfere with the natural development of the theme in hand. Toward the close of the discussion the leader should gather up the points that have been made and indicate their relations to the lesson as a whole.

The Weymouth translation of the New Testament passages of Scripture has been used because of its suggestiveness. It is not intended that it will supersede any other accepted version, or in any way throw discredit upon them. Its freshness and vigor make it serve the purpose of a commentary.

In the preparation of the material the valuable assistance of Miss Frederica Beard is gratefully acknowledged, Miss Beard having prepared the material contained in several of the lessons. Without the assistance of the members of the staff of the World Peace Foundation, and their generous permission to use a most valuable library, the task could not have been undertaken. The members of the Special Committee on Peace Instruction of the Commission on Christian Education of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, namely, Dr. B. S. Winchester, Dr. Francis E. Clark, Dr. Charles H. Levermore, Dr. W. K. Thomas, and Dr. P. H. Lerrigo, have considered the material in detail, and their opinions are reflected in its final form. Dr. Henry H. Meyer, secretary of the Commission on Christian Education, and Dr. B. S. Winchester, of the Special Committee on Peace Instruction, have had final editorial supervision of the manuscript in the process of its preparation. They have been in full sympathy with the point of view maintained in these lessons and, at the same time, solicitous that the method of their presentation should always be in accordance with sound educational principles.

On the basis of these lessons, there has been prepared a volume

of carefully chosen selections from the writings of the standard authorities on the subject of interracial fraternity. Only that material which has greatest value has been included. Many of the books consulted are not available to the leaders of the classes. And even if they were, there are many of these leaders who would not have the time to consult from ten to thirty books in getting ready to teach each lesson. It is in order to help the class leader to find, with the greatest ease and convenience, the very best thought bearing upon each lesson that "Selected Quotations on Peace and War" has been prepared. The results of a vast amount of labor in reading the hundreds of books that have been written on this subject and the painstaking evaluation of their contents is here placed in the hand of the busy leader. For illustrative material he should consult this book. With little time and effort he may become well informed and intelligently enthusiastic concerning the message of each lesson. This companion volume is indispensable to the leaders of the classes studying these lessons.

NORMAN E. RICHARDSON.

# INTERNATIONAL PEACE

## A Study in Christian Fraternity*

**A Course of Thirteen Lessons Prepared for the Commission on Christian Education of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, Cooperating with the Church Peace Union**

LESSONS WRITTEN BY
NORMAN E. RICHARDSON, Ph.D.

### LESSON I

### THE CHRISTIAN IDEAL OF WORLD-WIDE FRATERNITY

Study Acts 10: 1-35

**An Angel Brings a Message to Cornelius**

"Now a Captain of the Italian Regiment, named Cornelius, was quartered at Cæsarea. He was religious and God-fearing—and so was every member of his household. He was also liberal in his charities to the people, and continually offered prayer to God. About three o'clock one afternoon he had a vision, and distinctly saw an angel of God enter his house, who called him by name, saying,

"'Cornelius!'

"Looking steadily at him, and being much alarmed, he said,

"'What do you want, Sir?'

"'Your prayers and charities,' he replied, 'have gone up and have been recorded before God. And now send to Jaffa and fetch Simon, surnamed Peter. He is staying as a guest with Simon, a tanner, who has a house close to the sea.'

"So when the angel who had been speaking to him was gone, Cornelius called two of his servants and a God-fearing soldier who was in constant attendance on him, and, after telling them everything, he sent them to Jaffa.

**Peter's Vision**

"The next day, while they were still on their journey and were getting near the town, about noon Peter went up on the house-top to pray. He had become unusually hungry and wished for food; but, while they were preparing it, he fell into a trance. The sky had opened to his view, and what seemed to be an enormous sail was descending, being let down to the earth by ropes at the four corners. In it were all kinds of quadrupeds, reptiles and birds, and a voice came to him which said,

* Copyright, 1915, by Norman E. Richardson.

" 'Rise, Peter, kill and eat.'

" 'On no account, Lord,' he replied; 'for I have never yet eaten anything unholy and impure.'

"Again the second time a voice was heard which said,

" 'What God has purified, you must not regard as unholy.'

"This was said three times, and immediately the sail was drawn up out of sight.

**Arrival of the Servants of Cornelius**

"While Peter was greatly perplexed as to the meaning of the vision which he had seen, just then the men sent by Cornelius, having by inquiry found out Simon's house, had come to the door and had called the servant, and were asking,

" 'Is Simon, surnamed Peter, staying here?'

"And Peter was still earnestly thinking over the vision, when the Spirit said to him, 'Three men are now inquiring for you. Rise, go down, and go with them without any misgivings; for it is I who have sent them to you.'

"So Peter went down and said to the men,

" 'I am the Simon you are inquiring for. What is the reason of your coming?'

"Their reply was,

" 'Cornelius, a Captain, an upright and God-fearing man, of whom the whole Jewish nation speaks well, has been divinely instructed by a holy angel to send for you to come to his house and listen to what you have to say.'

"Upon hearing this, Peter invited them in, and gave them a lodging.

**Peter with Cornelius in Cæsarea**

"The next day he set out with them, some of the brethren from Jaffa going with him, and the day after that they reached Cæsarea. There Cornelius was awaiting their arrival, and had invited all his relatives and intimate friends to be present. When Peter entered the house, Cornelius met him, and threw himself at his feet to do him homage. But Peter lifted him up.

" 'Stand up,' he said; 'I myself also am but a man.'

"So Peter went in and conversed with him, and found a large company assembled. He said to them,

" 'You know better than most that a Jew is strictly forbidden to associate with a Gentile or visit him; but God has taught me to call no one unholy or unclean. So for this reason, when sent for, I came without raising any objection. I therefore ask why you sent for me.'

" 'Just at this hour, three days ago,' replied Cornelius, 'I was offering afternoon prayer in my house, when suddenly a man in shining raiment stood in front of me, who said, "Cornelius, your prayer has been heard, and your charities have been put on record before God. Send therefore to Jaffa, and invite Simon, surnamed Peter, to come here. He is staying as a guest in the house of Simon, a tanner, close to the sea."

" 'Immediately, therefore, I sent to you, and I thank you heartily for having come. That is why all of us are now assembled here in God's presence, to listen to what the Lord has commanded you to say.'

**Peter's Speech**

"Then Peter began to speak.

" 'I clearly see,' he said, 'that God makes no distinctions between one man and another; but that in every nation those who fear Him and live good lives are acceptable to Him." Acts 10: 1-35.

**Christianity Breaks Through the Restrictions of Judaism**

It should be kept in mind that Peter, who had been so close to Jesus and who had preached, on the day of Pentecost, the sermon so signally honored of God, was the same man who now receives a pure-blooded Italian into the Apostolic church. The startling fact is Peter's disregard for the rites of Judaism. Ancient traditions were broken and a new precedent established. Cornelius was received without his having to comply with the requirements which the Jews had always made of those who became proselytes to their faith. It was simply because he feared God and lived a good life that this new convert to Christianity was acceptable unto God and hence was worthy to be received. As a result of the vision, Peter had come to look upon anyone whom God regarded with favor as fit to be his own associate, even within the close, fraternal bonds of the early church. Cornelius, an Italian, entered into this vital fellowship simply as a man who had won God's approbation.

**Not Nationality But Goodness Makes Men Acceptable to God**

This incident suggests one of the ideals of Christianity. Peter was the leading apostle among the twelve. He was under the immediate direction of the Holy Spirit. As a Jew, he would naturally have had intense prejudice against a Gentile. Before the coming of Christ, intimate companionship between an orthodox Jew and an Italian had been unthinkable. It was believed that the spiritual injury resulting from such social contact would have been as great as would the physical injury to one eating unclean reptiles and birds. But as a Christian, Peter had a new standard by which to judge men. It was not nationality or race, but goodness that made men acceptable to God, and hence, to the followers of Jesus. Here before his eyes was a Gentile receiving the gift of the Holy Spirit, and becoming an inspired witness to the truth concerning Jesus Christ. Thus, Christianity, at its very beginning, broke away from race prejudice. On the basis of nationality, no distinction between one man and another was made. Do the Christian people of to-day fully appreciate this ideal? Are there any present-day "Peters"

who need a clear vision of this truth? What obstacles prevent foreigners from receiving just consideration? Can this principle be universally applied?

**A New Reverence**

"A Jew is strictly forbidden to associate with a Gentile or visit him; but God has taught me to call no one unholy or unclean." What a fundamental change took place in Peter's attitude toward those whom Judaism had taught him to despise! A new reverence for man was necessary before the leader of the apostles could associate with a Gentile. Peter was coming to understand the value of things human. He had made the discovery that the gift of the Holy Spirit was not confined to those of one favored race. God came and, in this peculiar and mysterious sense, took up his abode in the heart of a "foreigner." Those whom God had thus honored were not to be despised by any man, least of all by an apostle. How could one who looked up to God as Father despise or injure another whose spiritual possibilities were equal to his own? It is love of God that helps man to place a true evaluation upon all things human. The nearer Peter came to God, the more the artificial barriers between himself and men of other nations melted away.

**The Jewish Antipathy for the Gentiles**

One of the marked characteristics of Judaism had been its deep-seated prejudice and antipathies against the Gentile. The Jew was exclusive by training and tradition. He was apt to look with contempt upon everything outside the pale of Judaism. He was taught that to enter the house of a Gentile, much more to eat at a Gentile's table, involved ceremonial uncleanness. The richest blessing that could come to a Gentile was thought to be his becoming a proselyte to Judaism. The prophets pictured the Gentile world as being in darkness, waiting for the light that could come only from those who had inherited the promise to Abraham. Even the disciples of Jesus found it difficult to think of the blessings of the gospel as coming to the Gentiles except "through the portal of Judaism." How far does this ancient Jewish exclusiveness account for the wide-spread hatred of the Jews? What are some of the most common causes of interracial antipathy?

**Breadth of Sympathy**

The difficulty of laying aside the rites and customs which were the outward signs of ancient Jewish exclusiveness is vividly reflected in the dispute between Paul and Peter at Antioch. (See Gal. 2. 11-21). If Christianity had retained the forms and customs of Judaism, what would have been the probable result? Jesus undertook to destroy these ancient suspicions, this prejudice and interracial hatred. He astonished His disciples by conversing with a woman of Samaria. His ministry was marked by a breadth of sympathy that was at first inexplicable to His

most intimate associates. "One is your Father, all ye are brethren," he said. In the parable of the Good Samaritan he taught that the true spirit of neighborliness disregards the artificial barriers of race or creed. It embraces all men. Human values were placed above all accidents of birth or environment. He prayed that all of His disciples might be made one. And this oneness He explained in terms of His own relation to the Father. He died for the sins of the whole world. Being lifted up He said that He would draw all men unto Himself. He did not think of His sheep as being all of one fold. The disciples were commissioned to carry the good news to all nations. In the picture of the final judgment of the world (Matt. 25: 31-46) all nations are gathered before Him, and He then separates the righteous from the unrighteous. This final accounting recognizes only goodness. It ignores nationality, race, and language.

**Paul the Apostle to the Gentiles**

While it was Peter who, among the apostles, was first to realize fully the true value of those outside of Judaism, it was Paul whose ministry seemed, in a peculiar sense, to be dominated by this idea. Though a Pharisee and passionately identifying himself with all the traditions, laws, and prejudices of his narrow sect; though intensely provincial and consumed by hatred of those who dared to differ from the strict interpretation of Judaism, Paul achieved, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, breadth of sympathy and outlook. His cosmopolitan interests widened until they included, not only Europe, but also the world-wide Roman Empire. He never gave up his fervent belief in the doctrine of the election of Israel or his passionate love for Judaism. But these became spiritualized and humanized under the influence of Jesus. In the death of Jesus, Paul saw the only hope of the world. In the Son of God, the promise to Abraham had been fulfilled. With Paul, the fatherhood of God and the saviourhood of Jesus made all men one. The spiritual supremacy of Israel laid upon her a correspondingly great responsibility to serve the other nations. Is this life of Jesus Christ, formed anew in the members of different races, an adequate basis of interracial friendship? Is it possible for the members of every race to become true Christians?

**Jews and Gentiles Made One**

To the Ephesians Paul wrote: "To you Gentiles also—to you God has given life." He classified himself with the Gentiles with respect to having lived a sinful life, but, with them had been brought near to God by the death of Jesus, "For He is our peace —He who has made Jews and Gentiles one, and in His own human nature has broken down the hostile dividing wall, by setting aside the law with its commandments, expressed as they were, in definite decrees. His design was to unite the two sections of humanity in Himself so as to form one new man, thus effecting peace, and to reconcile Jews and Gentiles in one body to

God, by means of His cross—slaying by it their mutual enmity. So He came and proclaimed good news of peace to you who were so far away, and peace to those who were near; because it is through Him that Jews and Gentiles alike have access through one Spirit to the Father" (Eph. 2. 14-16). How does the strength of this religious bond compare with that of natural racial antagonisms? What are some of these antagonisms?

**Christianity and the Common Origin of Mankind**

The Christian doctrine of God the Creator was referred to by Paul when, addressing the Athenians, he said: "God who made the universe and everything in it"—"caused to spring from one forefather people of every race, for them to live on the whole surface of the earth"—"For we are also His offspring." (Acts 17: 24, 26, 28). Every member of the human race bears the image of God. Fundamentally, men are alike; God, their Creator, is one. A common origin is revealed in the human body which is similar in structure, constitution, and needs the world over. The human mind answers to human mind in every climate, latitude, age, or race. The differences that are most apparent are only skin deep. All human hearts recoil at pain and grief; all human life expands and develops in the presence of pleasure or joy. Members of the human race are universally religious; conscience is everywhere found; instincts have similar characteristics wherever they appear in human life. The oneness of the Creator is reflected in the oneness of the race. Is it sin for a Christian to harbor racial hatred? To what extent are race prejudices instinctive? Are the sentiments occasioned in some people by the manners of some Jews or the color of the Negro unavoidable? How is it possible to overcome sentiments that are instinctive?

**Is World-Wide Brotherhood Practicable?**

When working at a common task, men of different nations come to be warm friends. Their comradeship is like that of two soldiers who have lived and fought together. The feeling of brotherhood is often most intense in the various international conferences and conventions. Members of European races, coming to America, absorb the American spirit, adopt the Western ideals, become naturalized in more than a merely political sense. In two or three generations they are indistinguishable from other Americans. Common environment brings out common traits of character. It would seem that all of the members of the human family are by nature fitted for world citizenship. Is the Christian ideal of world-wide brotherhood practicable?

**The Public School**

The possibilities of world-wide fraternity are illustrated in many of the public schools of America. Here children find playmates and form friendships in races widely different from their own. Frequently in one room are gathered those who belong

to six or eight different nationalities. Jews, Irish, Armenian, German, French, and Italian all study the same lessons and frequently play together. Even the teacher may be of foreign birth. But here they all meet and mingle. "The little foreigners, assisted by their more well-informed comrades, learn the language of the land." "It will be difficult to stir Otto Schmidt, at any stage of his career, into antagonism against the Jewish race when he remembers the patience and loving kindness with which Maxie Fishandler labored with him and guided his first steps through the wilderness of the English tongue" (The American Public School as a Factor in International Conciliation, by Myra Kelly). Does it always come about that those who thus meet under such democratic and cosmopolitan conditions become fast friends? If not, why not? The Austrian Minister of Education was visiting an American high school in New York. When asked to pick out four typical Americans, to the amusement of all, he selected three Hungarians and one Bohemian.

**Common Fatherhood Implies Common Brotherhood**

Oneness of origin suggests oneness of destiny. The common task of establishing the kingdom of God on earth must be shared by all. Fundamental unity suggests cooperation, mutual consideration, brotherhood. Love of a common Father leads naturally to neighborliness. These two ideas lay together in the mind of Jesus. He considered them to be of such importance that He presented them as divine commandments to take precedence of all others. "Other commandments greater than these there is none." "Hear, O Israel! The Lord our God is one Lord! and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, thy whole mind, and thy whole strength." The second is this: "Thou shalt love thy fellowman as thou lovest thyself."

**The Stability of the Bonds of Brotherhood**

Like the cement of a great building which holds together bricks and stones, the common Fatherhood of God makes for solidarity and coherence in the human race. The question which history must decide is this, Are the centralizing and unifying forces stronger than any divisive tendencies and will they finally prevail? The bonds of universal brotherhood have a divine origin. They have the stability of the foundation of the universe. Is there not some divinely ordained form of society that corresponds to this ultimate unity of the human family? Disruptive forces such as race prejudice and suspicion shall not ultimately prevail. Like a great beacon light shining over the stormy sea of human superstition and selfish passion is the truth—"The Lord thy God is one." Why is it that this Christian ideal has been so long in receiving practical recognition? What changes are needed in the institutions of to-day in order that this ideal may be realized? How can Christian people hasten the time when it will be realized?

## LESSON II

## DANGERS IN MODERN NATIONALISM

Study Luke 10: 25-37

### How to Secure Eternal Life

"Then an expounder of the Law stood up to test Him with a question. 'Rabbi,' he said, 'what shall I do to inherit the Life of the Ages?'

" 'Go to the Law,' said Jesus, 'what is written there? how does it read?'

" 'THOU SHALT LOVE THE LORD THY GOD,' he replied, WITH THY WHOLE HEART, THY WHOLE STRENGTH, AND THY WHOLE MIND; AND THY FELLOW MEN AS MUCH AS THYSELF' (Deut. 6: 5; Lev. 19: 18).

" 'A right answer,' said Jesus; 'do that, and you shall live.'

"But he, desiring to justify himself, said,

" 'But what is meant by my fellow man"?'

"Jesus replied,

### The Kind Hearted Samaritan

" 'A man was once on his way down from Jerusalem to Jericho when he fell among robbers, who, after both stripping and beating him, went away leaving him half dead. Now a priest happened to be going down that way, and, on seeing him, passed by on the other side. In like manner a Levite also came to the place, and, seeing him, passed by on the other side. But a certain Samaritan, being on a journey, came where he lay, and, seeing him, was moved with pity. He went to him, and dressed his wounds with oil and wine and bound them up. Then placing him on his mule he brought him to an inn where he bestowed every care on him. The next day he took out two shillings and gave them to the innkeeper.'

" 'Take care of him,' he said, 'and whatever further expense you are put to, I will repay it to you at my next visit.'

" 'Which of those three seems to you to have acted like a fellow man to him who fell among the robbers?'

" 'The one who showed him pity,' he replied.

" 'Go,' said Jesus, 'and act in the same way' " (Luke 10: 25-37).

### A Picture of Spiritual Neighborliness

The parable of the good Samaritan has been referred to as a picture of spiritual neighborliness. A neighbor is one who is nigh or near to another. In the parable certain men are set forth as being unable or unwilling to come sufficiently near to

one in need to make it possible for them to help him. The only claim that the man in distress had upon the priest and the Levite or the good Samaritan was the fact that he was their "fellow man." The priest and the Levite probably knew how to draw near to another priest or Levite, but their spiritual neighborliness did not extend to one who was only "fellow man." Even when circumstances forced them to come into the immediate presence of acute human need they were unable to overcome the spiritual barriers that had been erected in their own minds. How are the sympathies of people to-day artificially restricted? Where or among whom is this spirit of exclusiveness most clearly seen?

**Including One's Fellow Man**

We do not know who this unfortunate man was. His nationality is not revealed. It is enough that he was a man. The Master proceeds upon the supposition that a lack of spiritual readiness and ability to give aid to one's fellow man when in need makes one unworthy of eternal life. The plain teaching of the parable is that any system of beliefs or customs or habits or associations that tends to separate a man from his fellow human beings should be avoided. It is breadth, not narrowness of sympathy that marks the one who keeps the second great commandment. The priest and the Levite had evidently circumscribed their sentiments, excluding all those persons who did not measure up to certain national, racial, or religious standards. If the man in need had been a fellow *priest* or fellow *Levite*, how easy it would have been for them to help him! But because he was only their fellow *man* he must wait for someone whose sympathies were as broad and inclusive as mankind. What was wanted was not the fellow-feeling of one priest for another, but just plain, ordinary human sympathy. The tender feelings of the priest and of the Levite were marred by narrowness and formality. Thus they were led to violate one of the greatest commandments. Is it a sin for one individual to be indifferent toward another simply because of racial distinctions? How is it possible for the ordinary Christian to develop a neighborliness as broad and whole hearted as was that of the Samaritan? Can one whose early experiences and observations are necessarily limited be expected to cultivate sympathies that transcend them so far as to take in the whole world? How is it possible to break through the systems of convictions, prejudices, customs or habits that are formed so easily during one's early years? Should priests lend a helping hand only to priests? Levites only to Levites? Canadians only to Canadians? Anglo-Saxons only to Anglo-Saxons?

**The Principle of Expanding Loyalty**

Psychologists have pointed out the fact that one's loyalty is at first restricted to a comparatively small group. The boy must first learn to be loyal to his gang before his sympathy can

embrace all society. Young people must learn to love their particular church and denomination before they can identify themselves in a spirit of intelligent devotion with all of Christendom. Loyalty is as subject to development as is intellect. The evident difficulty with the priest and the Levite is that their development in sentiment had been arrested. They had broadened out to a certain limit and then all further development had been intensive. They had come to have a higher and higher regard for priests and Levites, but with that growing intensity there had come a spirit of exclusiveness which at last made it impossible for them to lend a hand to anyone outside of their own set. Not all men could be priests or Levites and hence all men could not be admitted within the embrace of their charity. Here was sympathy, but not yet fully developed. How far are people responsible for their attitudes toward people of other races? How can an individual overcome prejudices built up in childhood as the result of home atmosphere?

**The Peril of Disregarding Common Bonds**

In this parable of the good Samaritan, Jesus points to the moral injury that results when a man's sympathies become narrowed. Both priest and Levite seem powerless to help one who is outside of their own small circles, even though that one is immediately before them and is suffering both physical pain and mental distress. They have disregarded the common bonds uniting them to their fellow men. The result is an attitude of indifference that, in this instance, amounts to heartlessness and cruelty. Narrowness reveals the presence of selfishness. The true follower of Jesus Christ discovers ever widening bonds uniting him to the other members of the great human family. The moral life is defective in that individual who does not recognize some bond of brotherhood uniting himself to every other human being. What is the real difference between the priest or the Levite and the one who, to-day, neither knows nor cares "how the other half lives"? Just what is the injury that comes to the one who is indifferent to all outside his own class or nation?

**Tribal Loyalty vs. Faith in Humanity**

The question naturally arises, is there ever any justification for a narrowing of this feeling of brotherhood? Love of God tends to intensify and broaden it. Are there any Christian duties or responsibilities which have a tendency to make it narrow? Why is it that Jesus did not add to his two great commandments a third, namely: Thou shalt love thine own country more dearly than any other? Does true patriotism involve an antagonistic attitude toward nations other than one's own? If the principle emphasized in the parable of the good Samaritan as applicable to individuals can be applied to nations as well, then why should not this new commandment read: Thou shalt love every other nation as thou lovest thine own? Christian patriotism involves something more than willingness to die for one's country in case

war is declared. It is not mere tribal loyalty but faith in humanity. In what sense may patriotism be unchristian? What is the point beyond which the determination to advance the interests of one's own country is sin? What is the true basis of love of one's country?

**Patriotism Both Provincial and Cosmopolitan**

Love of one's own country does not involve hatred of all countries other than one's own. To appreciate the land of one's birth it is not necessary to despise all other lands. An American is no more truly loyal to America because he speaks contemptuously of France or Austria. To despise the Rhine does not help one to appreciate the Hudson. "The patriotic Englishman is no traitor to Wordsworthshire because he loves the lakes and mountains of Italy and Switzerland." Egotism is no more a sign of greatness in a nation than in an individual. German citizenship does not detract from world citizenship any more than does citizenship in Massachusetts detract from that in the United States. Love of one's country is not incompatible with love of every other country. Hostility to another nation is not involved in loyalty to one's own. Patriotism can be both provincial and cosmopolitan. Can a man be patriotic under three flags? What are the essential characteristics of world citizenship? What is there in the form of government of the United States that ought to help its citizens to appreciate international cooperation and peace?

**A False Theory of National Greatness**

There are those who assert that a nation in order to preserve itself, must rely upon a great navy and army. But what is involved in such a policy? Within the past thirty years the United States has spent one thousand million dollars on her navy alone. It has been pointed out by Dr. Charles E. Jefferson that during that time millions of acres of desert land have been waiting for an adequate plan of irrigation, millions of acres of swamp land should have been drained, harbors should have been deepened and forests safe-guarded. There are "pests, implacable and terrible, like the gypsy moth, and plagues like tuberculosis, for whose extermination millions of money are needed at once. But the necessary money has not been available because of a false theory of national greatness. The nation that turns aside from its thousands of tubercular citizens, from its poor who live in malarial districts that it may prepare itself needlessly for aggressive hostilities against other nations, is open to the charge of negligence and cruelty." How does the commandment "Thou shalt not kill" apply to nations?

**One Nation Injuring Another**

The selfishness of this kind of nationalism that rests upon a military foundation is seen in its damaging effect upon other nations. "Every increase in the American navy strengthens the

militarists in London, Berlin, and Tokio." Thus the most pressing human needs are neglected not merely in one but in all countries. If one great nation measures its strength by the size of its navy and army—by its ability to inflict injury upon its neighbor nation—the inevitable tendency is that all other nations will be forced, because of economic reasons, to be less and less able to minister to the real human needs of the people. Under such a system the danger is that the moral development of the whole civilized world will be retarded and its educational, economic, and benevolent enterprises seriously interfered with. What promise is there in the fact that our best citizens no longer appeal to the duel in order to settle matters of personal honor? Is there in this fact a basis of hope that war between nations may some time come to an end?

**The Moral Value of True Patriotism**

Because there are some forms of nationalism that are morally dangerous, it does not follow that all love of one's country should be renounced. On the contrary, it is doubtful if an adequately intelligent appreciation of other nations is possible unless there is first of all an intelligent loyalty to one's own. The ordinary individual is unable at first to gather up within the range of his patriotism all of the nations of earth. But familiarity with the history of his own, admiration for its natural beauties, faith in its stability, enthusiasm for its high mission among the nations of earth, readiness to make personal sacrifices for the welfare of fellow citizens—all this helps the individual whose sympathies are broad to respect other nations and to reverence their sacred institutions. To understand the forces that bind the people of one nation together helps one to appreciate the bonds of international fraternity. How do the modern facilities of intercourse increase the moral demands upon nations?

**True and False Patriotism**

A careful distinction should be made between false and true patriotism. One consists largely in the singing of national hymns, saluting the flag, faithful observance of all national festivals, and the willingness to take up arms in defense of the national honor. The other is no less ready to salute the flag and celebrate the anniversaries of important events in the history of the nation, but all of these forms of expression do not take the place of the bonds uniting it to those of other nations. True patriotism does not take pleasure in the advancement of one nation at the expense of another. It is rather permeated with the Christian ideal of greatness as consisting in service. True patriotism is not without reverence for other nations. It is broadly human. It reflects the spirit of the good Samaritan rather than that of the priest or Levite. It is ready to lend a helping hand to members of other nations as well as to those of its own. A man's love for his home should add to, rather than detract from, his love for the community in which that home

is located. Why is pride in national character safer than pride in national possessions?

**The Dangers of Seeing Only One Side**

No one nation can reach its highest moral destiny while the other nations remain crushed by needless economic burdens or; socially undeveloped. If the selfish advancement of one is brought about at the expense of another, indirectly that advantage is sure to prove to be a moral detriment. There can be no such thing as merely one side in an international contest. It is easy to purchase a national victory at too great a price. No nation can hold another down without itself staying down on the same moral level. Emerson wrote: "We hesitate to employ a word so much abused as 'patriotism,' whose true sense is almost the reverse of the popular sense. We have no sympathy with that boyish egotism, hoarse with cheering for one side, for one state, for one town; the right patriotism consists in the delight which springs from contributing our peculiar and legitimate advantages to the benefit of humanity." How can true patriotism be developed in our nation? Is the church responsible for this task? How may the Christian virtue of interracial brotherliness be more adequately taught by the church to-day?

**Dangers Involved in a Superficial Love of Country**

Love of country or devotion to its interests involves so many things that very often its moral aspects are lost sight of. The patriotic sentiment easily interferes with a calm study of the issues involved. Citizens do not always stop to think whether or not a course of action proposed by their government is right. The duty of citizenship does not demand the enthusiastic and thoughtless approval of every act committed by one's nation. The true patriot should be ready to point out errors in national policies as well as to support them. This higher love of country requires more courage and self-sacrifice. It may involve temporary unpopularity or possible misunderstanding. Popular sentiment may, for a time, turn against it. But a nation is no better, morally, than the moral quality of its citizens. The policies of any government involve many facts and principles. The danger is that moral implications may be lost sight of when love of country is thought to require an easy acquiescence in every national act.

**Battleship or Statesmanship**

Christian nationalism is based upon reason rather than force. The question to be decided is, as Mr. Edwin D. Mead has suggested, which kind of ship, battleship or statesmanship, is to make up the ship of state. Those who would establish a nation upon a foundation of force are constantly reminding the people of racial antagonism, of possible injury that other nations may inflict, of the size and strength and preparedness of other armies and navies. Those who would build the nation upon reason

point out the common human interests, the social and economic interdependence of the nations and the divinely sanctioned bonds of international good-will. Mutual understanding and confidence among nations will lay a more enduring foundation for the future greatness of any one nation than will mutual distrust and its resulting misunderstandings. The attitude of one nation toward another determines in large measure what will be the attitude of that other nation. Suspicion fosters suspicion; prejudice breeds prejudice; force necessitates force. The great present need is for reason rather than force to characterize the relations between nations. For confidence stimulates confidence, and trust inspires trust. A nation as well as an individual can pursue a policy of erecting artificial and unnecessary barriers between itself and others. How are the mistakes of the priest and the Levite reflected in the type of nationalism now found among the nations?

**How to Avoid the Dangers of Modern Nationalism**

"What we want is an active class who will insist in season and out of season that we shall have a country whose greatness is measured, not only by its square miles, its number of yards woven, of hogs packed, of bushels of wheat raised; not only by its skill to feed and clothe the body, but also by its power to feed and clothe the soul; a country which shall be as great morally as it is materially; a country whose very name shall not only, as now it does, stir us as with the sound of a trumpet, but shall call out all that is best within us by offering us the radiant image of something better and nobler and more enduring than we, of something that shall fulfill our own thwarted aspiration, when we are but a handful of forgotten dust in the soil trodden by a race whom we shall have helped to make more worthy of their inheritance" (James Russell Lowell).

## LESSON III

## THE CHARACTER AND CAUSES OF WAR

Study Matt. 5: 21-26, 38-42

### What Is War?

War has been defined as "a properly conducted contest of armed public forces" (International Law, Wilson and Tucker). It "is not the mere employment of forces but the existence of the legal condition of things in which rights are or may be prosecuted by force. Thus, if two nations declare war one against the other, war exists though no force whatever may as yet have been employed. On the other hand, force may be employed by one nation against another, as in the case of reprisals, and yet no state of war may arise. In such a case there may be said to be an act of war, but no state of war. . . . When a state of war supervenes, third parties become subject to the performance of the duties of neutrality as well as to all the inconveniences that result" (International Law Digest, Moore). The appeal to force is the essential element in war. The avowed intention to use force creates a state of war.

### What Is Peace?

Peace is a state of tranquillity between public bodies. It may exist as the result of political agreements or military exhaustion. Usually, however, peace rests upon mutual respect and mutual understanding. As such it may be considered the normal or natural state of relations between bodies of men who have advanced beyond the primitive conditions of savagery or barbarism. Generally, it represents a public state of mind that is characterized by deliberation rather than impulsiveness. There may be present an occasion for a declaration of war; the instinctive impulses to begin a contest of armed forces may struggle for expression, but they are held in check. Peace is sometimes defined as "the duration of law; the absence of violence in social and political relations."

### War as an Economic Disturbance

When a nation undertakes to settle its differences with another nation by the use of armed public forces, where do these "forces" come from and what are they? The call to arms is not sent out to non-human beings who have nothing to do with factories, farms, and fisheries. It is sounded in the ears of men, wage-earners, fathers who by daily toil support their families. The workshop closes when war opens. Labor is diverted from its ordinary tasks and is used for non-productive ends. The works of public utility must wait while the "public forces" are carrying

arms. A piece of steel cannot be a sword and a plowshare at the same time. The hand that holds the sword cannot grasp the plow handle. And so want makes its appearance and with it, exorbitant prices for food and clothing. Money is raised by the creation of public debts, for only thus can the army be clothed and fed. War materials are costly. The economic disturbance lasts years after the war has come to a close.

**War as a Moral Disturbance**

In order to make these armed human forces highly efficient according to the standards of warfare, it is necessary to supply suitable motives. For this purpose, the motives that are found during times of peace are for the most part inconsistent. They have to be supplanted by others; more in accordance with the spirit of war. To bring this about, public officials and others devise various means, frequently making use of deliberate misrepresentations of facts. The desired motives are supplied with greatest ease in an atmosphere of ignorance and suspicion. Reference is made to "hostile forces" or "enemy." The dangers that threaten the nation are magnified. Love of fellow man, the feeling of human solidarity, mutual confidence and respect are banished and in their places are engendered international hatred, brutality, vengeance, greed, deceit, treachery, cruelty. The moral disturbance of war is so great that it has been described as the negation of civilization, as a reversal to savagery, or as a breaking down of the social sentiments, which have been built up during years of peace. When the destruction of human life is deliberately planned, no matter whether the method used is starvation or wholesale murder, moral degradation is involved. What are some of the common methods used to stir up the war spirit?

**In Time of Peace Prepare for War?**

War, to be carried on with greatest success, involves a long period of preparation. The material aspects of this preparation, such as the building of gunboats, fortresses, and arsenals, the training of young men in the art of war, and the maintenance of military academies, all serve to keep before the public the possibility of there being an economic and a moral disturbance at some future time. Thus preparation for war increases the probability of war. Give other reasons why this is true. Ideas are forces leading to action. Peaceful ideas lead to peaceful actions. The time of peace presents opportunities for travel, commerce, and other methods of cultivating mutual understanding and appreciation. Then it is that schools, industries, churches, homes, and public museums are built up, profiting not a little from the influences that come from other nations. If, during such a period of peace, militarists successfully advocate extensive preparations for war, they not only increase economic burdens, but also deliberately throw dust into the eyes of those whose moral vision is none too clear at best. What are some of

the most common arguments in favor of a big navy and army? How can they be successfully answered?

**The Passion for Power**

One of the fruitful causes of war is the passion for power. There are many forms in which this passion finds expression. It may appear as an attempt to gain more territory, to get control of a river or a harbor, or to exercise authority over a weaker nation. Channing said that the type of ambition which chiefly covets power over fellow-creatures has instigated more crimes and spread more misery than any other cause. Is this true? When the motive of conquest is that of awakening, enlightening, or elevating those of another and more backward nation, giving them liberty and self-government as soon as they are prepared to undertake such responsibilities, moral elements may easily be found. But such international magnanimity does not usually cause a nation to appeal to armed forces. The passion for domination is more apt to lead to pillage and butchery than to the restoration of family and other social ties and the building up of public institutions having as their end the welfare of the conquered people. Does the conquest and possession of a colony always strengthen the conqueror? Illustrate from history this passion for power and its results.

**War, the Result of the Ambition of Royalty**

This passion for power is more apt to be found in a monarchy than in a democracy. Where one ruler exercises inherited rights to hold sway over his subjects, there is likely to appear a temptation for him to enlarge his sway by using the vast resources at his command in order to subjugate other people. His own subjects are therefore called upon to pay the price of his ambition. Honest and industrious citizens are transformed into armed fighters. In order to satisfy an individual's selfish passion for dominion, "by fire and sword, by butchery and pillage they are compelled to undertake to reduce others to their own lot." Thus the lust for power of one who does not have the moral right to extend his control causes homes to be destroyed and the souls of men to be forced into slavery. Noah Webster says: "As the rulers of a nation are as liable as other people to be governed by passion and prejudice, there is as little prospect of justice in permitting war for the decision of national disputes as there would be in permitting an incensed individual to be in his own case complainant, witness, judge, jury, and executioner." If lust for power is a ruler's motive in going to war, what should be the attitude of his subjects concerning enlistment?

**Various Causes of War**

A passion for power on the part of an individual or a small group of individuals is only one of many unworthy motives that have led to war. Revenge has been passed on from generation to generation in a royal family. Fear or hatred between indi-

viduals has plunged empires into gigantic schemes of destruction and death. Petty personal jealousies sometimes assume political and even international significance. The actual occasions of war are often absurdly inadequate. A diplomat makes a mistake and rather than face public humiliation resorts to methods that involve the economic and moral injury of his country. The rash precipitation of actual hostilities has sometimes been the cause of an otherwise unnecessary war. Sensational newspapers and magazines tend to create public sentiment in favor of armed hostility by exaggeration, distortion, and other misrepresentation of facts. Army officials who are ignorant of the total human and economic cost of war urge the settlement of international questions by an appeal to force with as much complacency as though might could make right. Can there be such a thing as a holy or righteous war? What would be the nature of the causes leading to such a war? How, in the future, can unworthy causes be prevented from leading to war?

**Creating a Market for the Armaments of War**

It is a well known fact that the European manufacturers of armaments of war have been active in creating public sentiment and influencing legislation in favor both of war and of the preparations for war. The ultimate aim is to create a market for rifles, cannon, gunboats, and cartridges. Persistent and highly intelligent activity of this character must be looked upon as one of the causes of war. The effect of this policy of promotion is far-reaching. Preparation for war involves being equipped with armaments that contain the very latest inventions. A "slight improvement in the rifle may render a dozen million firearms obsolete." Immediately there is created a practical necessity of getting rid of old-fashioned stock. The newer models are costly. So in an effort to realize as much money as possible for the old, a nation sells it to the "other primitive but warlike folks." Thus, as a result of the selfish, financial interests of manufacturers and inventors, the spirit of war is intensified among the tribes of Central Africa, Northwest India, and the Gold Coast. Frequently, it is not national necessity, but shrewd promotive activity on the part of the agents of armament manufacturers that leads to the purchase of the implements of war and to the actual precipitation of active warfare.

**War in the Light of Christianity**

The true moral character of war is more clearly seen when it is studied in the light of the teachings of Christianity. One of the fundamental principles laid down by Jesus Christ is that human life is sacred. The Christian spirit of love includes enemies as well as friends. All human life is too sacred to be destroyed. Peace makers are looked upon with high favor. Love and service are set forth as the true methods of conquest. True greatness is measured by service.

**Anger and Murder**

Some of the most significant utterances of Jesus indicating His attitude toward those conditions without which war would be impossible, are found in the Sermon on the Mount. In Matthew 5: 21-26, 38-42 we read: "'You have heard that it was said to the ancients, "THOU SHALT NOT COMMIT MURDER" (Exod. 20: 13) and whoever commits murder will be answerable to the magistrates. But I say to you that every one who becomes angry with his brother shall be answerable to the magistrate; that whoever says to his brother "Raca," shall be answerable to the Sanhedrin; and that whoever says, "You fool!" shall be liable to the Gehenna of Fire. If therefore when you are offering your gift upon the altar, you remember that your brother has a grievance against you, leave your gift there before the altar, and go and make friends with your brother, first, and then return and proceed to offer your gift. Come to terms without delay with your opponent while you are yet with him on the way to the court; for fear he should obtain judgment from the magistrate against you, and the magistrate should give you in custody to the officer and you be thrown into prison. I solemnly tell you that you will certainly not be released till you have paid the very last farthing.'"

**All Revenge Is Forbidden**

"'You have heard that it was said, "EYE FOR EYE, TOOTH FOR TOOTH" (Exod. 21: 24). But I tell you not to resist a wicked man, but if any one strikes you on the right cheek, turn the other to him as well. If any one wishes to go to law with you and to deprive you of your under garment, let him take your outer one also. And whoever shall compel you to convey his goods one mile, go with him two. To him who asks, give; from him who would borrow, turn not away.'" Is the New Testament teaching concerning peace and war morally higher than that of the Old Testament? Is it possible for a Christian nation to adopt a standard that is higher than that of its surrounding nations? In these passages of Scripture Christ intended to denounce murder and the motives that lie back of it. "Come to terms without delay with your opponent," is consistent with his entire message of peace. "Make friends with your brother first" and then offer your sacrifice to God, is but the natural application of His great law of love. Those who instigate wars of aggression plainly contradict the teachings of Christ. War involves motives that are selfish, brutal, murderous. War, as sometimes carried on, is plain murder but on a grand scale. It legalizes killing, but, even though legalized, wars of aggression cannot become either moral or Christian. God is not always on the side of the strongest battalions. The appeal to arms is not an appeal to justice. The Christian commandment is that man should love his fellow man—to hate him is sin. Christ teaches that not only the outward act of committing murder but also the inner heart attitude of hatred is forbidden. If this law applies to

individuals should it apply as well to groups of individuals, whether a community or a nation? The old law of revenge, "Eye for eye, tooth for tooth," appealed to by either an individual or a nation, is inconsistent with the Christian religion. Yet does not history show that this motive has prompted many a ruler to plunge into war, and many a people to carry it on? The Christian suffers long and is kind even to an enemy. In view of this attitude of Christianity toward murder, can there be such a thing as war carried on in a Christian spirit? Can we say that all taking of human life in battle is murder? Why is it that soldiers are not looked upon as murderers?

**The True Moral Nature of War**

War is coming to be looked upon as distinctly anti-social. The welfare of the race involves the solidarity of the race. When one nation inflicts an injury upon another, both victor and vanquished are injured. Righteous ends may be sought by the use of unrighteous methods. Can the end ever justify the means? War destroys the best human stock in the warring nation. "Violence, lying, and bribery that occur only among individuals without the pale, are found among the established means of intercourse with honored nations." Why should men who would never think of using their fists or revolvers to settle a dispute with a neighbor consent to their nation's going to war in order to decide the location of a boundary line? The socially destructive results of such methods between nations are at last apparent. Any deep injury to one nation indirectly is an injury to every nation. The moral standards that govern the conduct of individuals should govern also that of nations. Are God's standards of righteousness and justice always violated by war? There are not double standards of truth, justice, love, and mercy—one for individuals and another for nations. Both the character and the causes of wars of aggression are contrary to the teachings of Christianity. They inflict permanent injury upon the race. They defy justice and enthrone force. Christ points out even selfish reasons for maintaining peace with one's neighbor. Besides the selfish reasons, what are the social reasons for a nation's following a policy of peace?

**Militarism the Negation of Christianity**

"Militarism is the absolute negation of Christianity. The one exhibits a mailed fist; the other shows you a hand that is pierced. The one carries a big stick; the other carries the cross on which the Prince of Glory died. The one declares that might makes right; the other affirms that right makes might. The one says that the foundation of all things is force; the other says that the foundation of all things is love. Militarism is materialism in its deadliest manifestation. It is atheism in its most brutal and blatant incarnation. It is the enemy of God and man" (Charles E. Jefferson).

## LESSON IV

## THE CONSEQUENCES OF WAR

Study Lev. 19: 18; Gal. 5: 13-16

**Counting the Whole Cost**

Various attempts have been made to estimate the total cost of war. Frequently the results of such efforts have led to admissions that it is impossible to reckon "the butcher's bill" in its entirety. For war destroys life as well as property, homes as well as houses, social as well as industrial wealth. War inflicts injury upon the soul as well as upon the body of a nation. It increases burdens and decreases the power to carry them. The tasks of reconstruction that follow a period of active hostile engagements are taken up with a sense of moral as well as economic poverty—for the losses are heart losses. To count the whole cost, it is necessary to know all about the lives of those who were killed or injured and of those who were left to carry on the nation's work—all about their interests and ideals as well as their material possessions. In view of the whole cost of war, what are the causes which alone can justify one nation in taking up arms against another? What is there that is of greater value than human life?

**Money and Property Loss**

In modern warfare, there has been an attempt to decrease the destruction of property. Private property on land and sea is coming in many quarters to be looked upon as "immune from seizure and destruction." The unnecessary destruction of buildings is avoided in warfare that is carried on under the latest international agreements. This effort to protect property, however, emphasizes the thoroughly destructive character of war. "General Sherman estimated that property to the amount of at least three hundred millions of dollars was destroyed outright by his army during the march to the sea." Forty thousand millions of dollars is a sum so vast that the mention of it leaves only a confused impression upon the mind; but that is about what the nations have paid in solid cash in *a single century* for the folly and wickedness of their quarrels and fighting, their mutual injustices and slaughters. (The Cost of War, by Benjamin F. Trueblood.) How much human suffering is represented in this gigantic destruction! What compensations could justify it? In what sense does property represent life? Is property more sacred than the life that produced it? Why is it that civilized nations are becoming increasingly careful not to destroy property unnecessarily?

**War's Destruction of Art**

The destruction of property is not confined to buildings that are commonplace in structure or use. Works of art are frequently the objects of direct vandalism. Priceless treasures, that represent the soul of a former age, perish and the pity is, there is no one left to incarnate the spiritual ideals which they represent and once more give them permanent forms of expression. When the Cathedral of Rheims was being bombarded a thoughtful student of history pleaded with the destroyers to take the lives of the soldiers if necessary but to spare the matchless expression of the religious interest and architectural genius of a former century. The soldiers might be replaced, he said, but if the cathedral were ruined an invaluable historic monument would vanish forever. Educators are making much of the social and aesthetic inheritance of children. The traditions of the family to which a child belongs should be built into his home environment. Thus he learns to reverence the spiritual achievements of the past. A house with bare walls can no more be a home than can a city with its art treasures all in ruins be more than poverty stricken in terms of these social values. What influence does a cathedral have upon the people living near it? Why is it that multitudes of people visit Saint Paul's in London and Saint Peter's in Rome? Why are cities justified in maintaining art galleries and museums?

**Trade Routes and Their Importance**

With the rapid and extensive development of world commerce and the resulting complexity in the arteries of trade, the importance of trade routes has been greatly increased. Every great nation, such as Great Britain, United States, Germany, Russia, or France, is coming to be more and more "dependent upon either the control or the neutrality of international trade routes. They are needed, first, for security; second, for growth; and third, for the necessities and comforts of its own people." For instance: "In both England and Germany, as in the United States, the steel industry is one of the most vital: but the manufacture of steel depends upon the use of ferro-manganese, all of which is imported from India, Brazil, and Asiatic Russia" (E. R. Babson, The Future of World Peace, p. 40). The ocean highways have become as important to the nation as are the arteries to the body. These important trade routes, over which come many of the necessities of a nation's life, are usually among the first to be injured by war. In some instances breaking out of international hostilities has absolutely closed these vital trade routes—throwing thousands of men out of employment and ruining, temporarily at least, important industries. As a result of war, these injuries frequently become permanent because another nation has gained control of the trade routes without which industrial success is impossible. Why is it that the importance of these trade routes is sure to increase? Will war ever be abolished simply because of commercial reasons?

### The Indirect Money Cost of War

To the direct and immediate cost of war both in money and the destruction of property, must be added the indirect cost such as pensions and interest upon war loans. It is estimated that the United States will have paid out not less than $5,000,000,000 in pensions before this item of indirect cost of the Civil War shall have been paid. This is more than one half of the total direct cost of the war, both North and South. The interest on the public debt—nearly all of which was incurred as a result of the war—has already amounted to $2,500,000,000. The present annual interest burden is $25,000,000. It is estimated that, in various ways, the States have paid out to indigent soldiers and sailors more than $800,000,000. This does not include the privately endowed homes and other institutions. The annual interest upon the national debt of France, before the last great war, was $200,000,000. The indirect cost to France of the Franco-Prussian War will amount to between two and three times the original direct cost. Why should a nation pay such enormous sums in pensions to soldiers? What is the difference between a national debt and a personal obligation? How much money does the average American citizen pay every year on account of the direct and indirect cost of American militarism? Is it less than $200?

### Who Carries This Enormous Burden?

It must be remembered that the ultimate burden of raising these vast sums of money rests upon the people who must buy clothes and food and who either build homes or pay rent to landlords. This increased cost of bare living necessities, due, of course, not wholly but certainly in large measure to the direct and indirect cost of war, has an ethical meaning that should not be overlooked. Because of it boys and girls leave school as soon as they are fourteen years of age and become wage earners handicapped for life for want of an education. Because of it children are made to carry excessive burdens. Parents become discouraged and their abnormal emotions work a moral injury upon their offspring. Educational and philanthropic institutions suffer. The government is unable to guard the social, commercial, and moral welfare of the people as it should. Money is life. It is power. And when by any method of taxation it is taken away from people, in the majority of instances it means decreased power and restricted life. Under what circumstances has one generation the right to pass on to another burdens of taxation that result from its own wars? Would the cost of giving a college education to every American boy and girl be greater or less than the total American war budget?

### Decreased Reproductive Power

The consequences of war include the decreased reproductive powers of the generation involved. When a nation faces a danger that threatens its life, it is the men who are physically perfect,

and especially the young men who have not yet become fathers, whose lives are exposed. In the North Carolina room of the Confederate Museum in Richmond, Virginia, the following statement appears in large type: "With a voting population of 115,000, North Carolina contributed 125,000 soldiers to the Confederate service." It is not until the young and physically perfect soldier has been sacrificed that the older men and those short of stature or physically imperfect are accepted. The first recruits to fall are the ones that the nation can least afford to lose. The morally and physically inferior men are left behind to pass on the torch of life to a coming generation. Thus their own inferiority becomes fastened upon the national stock. No matter what acquisitions of territory result from war, the price of victory is too high. It is not enough to look upon the young soldier as an individual. He is potentially the head of a family. The reproductive power of a nation is decreased numerically, devitalized physically and degenerated morally by war. How many jails, poorhouses, and insane asylums, being maintained by the present generation, have been occasioned by the wars of the past? In view of this fearful moral cost of war, can any armed conflict be justified? What is the relation between the social evil in Europe and the past European wars?

**Some Economic Consequences**

This injury strikes at the very life-blood of the nation. If children are not well born they are permanently handicapped. No subsequent training can make up for a defective inheritance. It is well said that when God wants to make a man He begins with the great grand parents. The economic losses resulting from war consist not only in the buildings wrecked, the commerce destroyed and the business deranged, but also in the buildings not yet erected, the commerce not yet developed, and the business not yet built up. If the million men lost in the Civil War—most of them young, vigorous, and enterprising—had been spared to throw their energy into the development of the great untamed West and North and South—what might have been! The whole nation suffers economically and will suffer for decades to come because so many of those whom God intended for leaders in business, industrial, and professional life faced death prematurely. Their splendid devotion to a noble cause but intensifies the meaning of their loss. Who can picture what this world might have been, economically, had it not been for war? Is the Holy City too extravagant a symbol of this world if all industrial and moral capacities were conserved? It has been estimated that if the war system could have been done away with a century ago, the earning power of the world would be $5,200,000,000 annually greater than it now is.

**Judging Consequences**

Paul judged things by their consequences. He had a vision of the abundant, the rich and full human life that was worthy

of his intimacy with Jesus. To conserve man's largest possibilities was the superb aim of all his toil. His direct and vigorous attack upon sin was in the interest of this larger life. After wide experience and observation and familiarity with a splendid moral and religious inheritance, he was of the conviction that life's most precious possessions are not material. They are spiritual. Like a great watch-dog of Jehovah—"hound of the Lord"—he guarded the hearts of man. With the ringing clearness of the sharp bark of a watch-dog at midnight he calls out to men to beware of their lower natures. The things that destroy life he calls sin. And he traces sin to its origin. It is because war is a vivid and tangible expression of spiritual forces that lie beneath the surface that Paul's message to the Galatians is now pertinent.

**Love Restrains from War Those Who Are Free**

"You, however, brethren, were called to freedom. Only do not turn your freedom into an excuse for giving way to your lower natures; but become bondservants to one another in a spirit of love. For the entire Law has been obeyed when you have kept the single precept, which says, 'YOU ARE TO LOVE YOUR FELLOW MAN EQUALLY WITH YOURSELF' (Lev. 19: 18). But if you are perpetually snarling and snapping at one another, beware lest you are destroyed by one another.

**The Spirit and Man's Earthly Nature**

"This then is what I mean. Let your lives be guided by the Spirit, and then you will certainly not indulge the cravings of your lower natures. For the cravings of the lower nature are opposed to those of the Spirit, and the cravings of the Spirit are opposed to those of the lower nature; because these are antagonistic to each other, so that you cannot do everything to which you are inclined. But if the Spirit is leading you, you are not subject to Law.

**The Outcome of Man's Sinful Nature**

"Now you know full well the doings of our lower natures. Fornication, impurity, indecency, idol-worship, sorcery; enmity, strife, jealousy, outbursts of passion, intrigues, dissensions, factions, envyings; hard drinking, riotous feasting, and the like. And as to these I forewarn you, as I have already forewarned you, that those who are guilty of such things will have no share in the Kingdom of God.

**The Fruit Borne by the Spirit**

"The Spirit, on the other hand, brings a harvest of love, joy, peace; patience toward others, kindness, benevolence; good faith, meekness, self-restraint. Against such things as these there is no law. Now those who belong to Christ Jesus have crucified their lower nature with its passions and appetites. If we are living by the Spirit's power, let our conduct also be governed

by the Spirit's power. Let us not become vain-glorious, challenging one another, envying one another" (Gal. 5: 13-26).

**Destroyed by One Another**

The result of snarling and snapping is destruction. By war property is destroyed, the body is mangled, future generations are blighted, character is injured. It is with the last of these especially that Paul is concerned. When the cravings of the lower nature are indulged, the guidance of the Spirit, which otherwise would bring a harvest of love, joy, peace, is lost. The one whose conduct is not governed by the Spirit's power is in need of being forewarned. For the resulting enmity, strife, jealousy, outburst of passion, intrigues, dissensions, factions, envyings, shut one out from having a share in the Kingdom of God. The moral breakdown leads to the most serious consequences. How does war reveal the presence of those attitudes and sentiments the results of which Paul declares to be dangerous, even preventing one from having a part in the Kingdom of God? Can there be such a thing as an appeal to organized, destructive force, carried on in a spirit of love or joy or peace?

**The Moral Damage of War**

Moral damage results no matter whether the snarling and snapping is done by an individual or by a nation. The ordinary man, whether singly or by battalions, in order to use force successfully, must rely upon the impulses that rise out of his lower nature. Organized "snarling" involves the use of newspapers, magazines, diplomats, and other official representatives. The demoralization of the public press and of those whose professional duty it is to further the selfish interests of the nation which they represent at the expense of another, inevitably results. What is the moral effect upon newspaper men who report continued victories when the armies are meeting with defeat after defeat? Organized "snapping" has reached a gloriously grand stage. Modern engines of war can batter to pieces a city ten or fifteen miles away. "Machine guns can mow men down by the acre." Airships can fly to a distant city in the night and drop deadly explosives upon innocent, slumbering children and women. Does the fact that the destruction of life and property is enormous, purify the motives of the destroyer? What can be the moral tone of a group of gunners who catch a battalion of brave soldiers unaware and annihilate them with a hail storm of death-dealing bullets?

**The Larger Moral Damage**

It is a law of human life that after a sudden and intense outburst of hatred, envy or any other destructive emotion, the individual may with relative ease return to his normal condition. The moral or social injury is apt to be less if such an expression can take place immediately and the occasions of its return be

avoided. But war involves extensive organization for destructive purposes. When soldiers enlist, they set aside months or even years of their lives to follow up the systematized work of destruction. Hence they are called upon to live for months in a low moral atmosphere with deception, lying, trickery, vulgarity, and brutality on every hand. Naturally the camp and navy yard become places of vice. The demoralizing process is cumulative. When moral self-control gives way at one point the whole character is weakened, power to resist temptation in other forms is decreased, the whole moral tone is lowered. Recovery from such spiritual debasement is most difficult. Why is it that vice is so prevalent about a navy yard or army camp?

**Damage to Public Sentiment and National Ideals**

Under thoroughly democratic conditions in order to carry on war successfully, it is necessary that the enterprise be supported by public opinion. Sentiments and convictions in large numbers and in favor of the undertaking must somehow be created. Without the "moral support" of the nation back of it, the army's efficiency is decreased. Individual heroism is often supported by the thought of national appreciation. When a nation undertakes to carry on a war of aggression with a view to the acquisition of territory or the subjugation of another race, the channels of publicity such as newspapers and magazines become responsible for the creation of suitable public opinion. This involves wholesale deception and misrepresentation. A censorship is established. But why? Why not "turn on the light" and let the whole truth be known? What must be the moral effect upon editors, reporters, and publishers charged with the task of reducing national ideals to the moral plane of an unjust war, of arousing nation-wide passions that belong to the lower and bestial natures of men?

**The Opinion of a Historian**

The following paragraph, quoted in Lecky's "The Map of Life" (p. 92), gives the historian's opinion concerning the moral consequences of war: "War is not, and never can be, a mere passionless discharge of a painful duty. Its essence, and a main condition of its success, is to kindle into fierce exercise among great masses of men the destructive and combative passions—passions as fierce and as malevolent as that with which the hound hunts the fox to its death or the tiger springs upon its prey. Destruction is one of its chief ends. Deception is one of its chief means; and one of the great arts of skillful generalship is to deceive in order to destroy. Whatever other elements may mingle with and dignify war, this at least is never absent; and however reluctantly men may enter into war, however conscientiously they may endeavor to avoid it, they must know that when the scene of carnage has once opened, these things must be not only accepted and condoned, but stimulated, encouraged, and applauded."

**The Final Test**

If one man kills another, society demands a thorough investigation to ascertain the facts. The motives that led up to the killing must pass a rigid moral examination. Homicide becomes murder if the motive is on the moral plane of envy, greed, revenge, or hatred. When ten men kill a hundred, or when a thousand men kill three thousand, why is it not still murder, only, more of it, provided the motives are immoral? Was there ever a war in which such motives were not involved? "The Spirit . . . brings a harvest of love, joy, peace; patience toward others, kindness, benevolence; good faith, meekness, self-restraint." Does war ever bring such a harvest? Judged by its consequences, does war originate in the lower or in the higher nature of man?

## LESSON V

## THE MORAL EQUIVALENTS OF WAR

Study 2 Cor. 11: 21-31

**The Instinct of Mastery**

Struggle is essential to growth. The instinct of mastery is God-given; overcoming is the business of life. If it had not been for this instinct the best in life to-day would not have been possible. But the question at once arises, Who, and what, is to be overcome? If mastery is to be attained only through overcoming a fellow-man then the law of growth through struggle does not apply to all; one goes up and in the meantime another goes down. Can there be a law of human life that is moral and yet not universal in its application? The value of struggle is not, of course, altogether dependent on success or victory, but if through one man's increasing strength, another man is made increasingly weak, opportunity for development is denied to the latter. Injustice is at once evident, and justice is fundamental in moral law. Therefore, the instinct of mastery *expressed in this way* violates the universal law of human development or progress.

**Shall the Fighting Instinct Die Out?**

If war were to be abolished would any true interest of humanity necessarily suffer? Can anything that is morally wrong be really necessary? Would it be a good thing for the race if the fighting instinct were to die out? (Think of fighting as one expression of the instinct of mastery). Is it possible to answer "*No*" to all of these questions and still to be consistent? War might die out and no harm be done, but if the fighting instinct were to die out the race might become within a generation or two a puny, weak, cowardly people incapable of self-sacrificing devotion. This instinct, like some others, may have a value *for a time* in every developing human being, but it may be gradually transmuted into something higher and nobler, a something that would be impossible without this root. The boyish fight in which there is a spirit of justice, of fair play, of satisfaction in achievement without the selfish glorying over a comrade, is very different from one of revenge and cruelty with intent to injure, and is much better than a milder play in which there is meanness and trickiness. "If," says Prof. Balliet, "you crush the fighting instinct you get the coward; if you let it grow wild you have the bully; if you train it, you have the strong, self-controlled man of will?" Jane Addams reminds us that "The little lad who stoutly defends himself on the school ground may be worthy of much admiration, but if we find him, a dozen years later, the

bullying leader of a street gang who bases his prestige on the fact that 'no one can whip him' our admiration cools amazingly, and we say that the carrying over of those puerile instincts into manhood shows arrested development which is mainly responsible for filling our prisons." What are some of the "childish things" that a man, full-grown, must learn to "put away"?

**Conservation of Force**

By exercise, strength is developed. This is, of course, equally true of physical, intellectual, and moral force. But an expenditure of force toward some definite end and for some worthy purpose beyond that of mere exercise brings a double good, for back of the exercise is the motive power and following it is the result achieved. Without such a result energy is lost. Effort that brings no profit involves at least a partial waste of energy. Is such a waste justifiable? One of the most important questions to be solved is, What kinds of profitable struggle can be substituted for that of war? It is essential to think not only of self profit but of social profit. Is there any way, other than war, by which the splendid forcefulness of humanity can be conserved?

**The Use of Force Controlled by Motive and Result**

In discussing the Christian idea of force in the American Friends' Peace Conference, Dr. Richard Thomas has shown that force is not to be eliminated but to be put to right use. "Force may be briefly defined as power made effective for use. Thus we speak of spiritual, mental, and physical force, and of the various forces of nature. Without force no results are accomplished. Therefore, when a man of peace says, 'I do not believe in using force,' however praiseworthy his meaning may be, his words are incorrect, and he lays himself open to the charge of being a mere visionary. When he explains: 'I believe not in the use of physical, but of spiritual and moral force,' his opponent answers: 'Your child is about to cut himself with a sharp knife; will you not snatch it from him?' 'Certainly.' 'He is running toward a precipice. You shout to him to stop. Either he does not hear, or will not obey. Will you not run and catch him, and save him?' He replies, 'That is different. It is right to do these things.' Yes, it is right, but you cannot do them without physical force. Your real contention, then, is not against physical force, as such, but against the wrong use of it. We cannot even say that under all circumstances the use of brute force is wrong. A Samson might hold a lunatic or a criminal, to restrain him from violence, in his strong embrace, not brutally, but by brute force, and receive from the most ardent peace advocate nothing but praise. Then even brute force is not always wrong, so it be not brutally used. Further, if physical force may sometimes be well used, spiritual and moral force may be wrongly used. The assassin of our late President, for instance, claimed his deed to be morally right, and if, as the Bible says, there be

such a thing as spiritual wickedness, there must also be a wrong use of spiritual power. From the simple human standpoint, which is, after all, hardly removed from the divine, we may therefore conclude that of all the great divisions of force, spiritual and moral, physical and mechanical, none are in themselves either right or wrong, but that the moral element lies in the manner in which they are used and the object to be gained." This suggests the question: Is there any moral value in sacrifice that does not result in good to humanity? If a man loses his life for an unworthy cause, how is he benefited? In what ways can a man lose his life for the sake of the cause of Christ?

**Lawful Conquest**

Illustrating from the game contests of the olden time Paul says, "He is not crowned except he have contended lawfully" (2 Tim. 2: 7). In this there is a recognition of the other player, of what is fair to all. A lawful conquest is one that occasions no injury to another. Force expended to increase cooperation between parts of the body politic is desirable. A conquest of nature in the development, for example, of roads and waterways by an individual nation, or by the cooperation of several, illustrates a wise expenditure of force. A "World's Fair" that stimulates both individual energy and collective work, that calls for legitimate competition and at the same time cooperative effort, is another opportunity for "lawful contention." Is it possible to remain unselfish in all one's striving and yet be thoroughly practical?

**Changing Ideals**

Progressive ideals are as certain as progressive truth. The ideal of yesterday has served its day. What is to follow? *What shall, by and by, become actual?* Jane Addams points the way: "At the present moment the war spirit attempts to justify its noisy demonstrations by quoting its great achievements in the past and by drawing attention to the courageous life which it has evoked and fostered. We may admire much that is admirable in this past life of courageous warfare, while at the same time we accord it no right to dominate the present, which has traveled out of its reach into a land of new desires. We may admit that the experiences of war have equipped the men of the present with pluck and energy, but to insist upon the selfsame expression for that pluck and energy would be as stupid a mistake as if we would relegate the full-grown citizen, responding to many claims and demands upon his powers, to the school-yard fights of his boyhood, or to the college contests of his cruder youth."

**A Change of Form**

Progress depends upon struggle, upon an expression of human will in a continuous effort, but social evolution requires *a change of form.* What are some of the institutions that have served their day and must now be laid aside? What good achievements of the past have been accomplished by warfare? Are those now

required? What worthy sentiments have they engendered? Can these sentiments be conserved through other means? The moral ideal of to-day demands that higher moral results be accomplished through achievements of a different type. Primitive methods were necessary for primitive conditions. The development of life gives a wider social outlook and changing ideals are sure to result. With these changing ideals primitive methods can no longer be of service. Why is it that a man living a solitary life needs moral sentiments that are less sensitive than those demanded of the one living in a crowded community? Primitive methods of settling disputes should not be employed after courts of justice have been established. Why is this so?

**Moral Equivalents**

What shall take the place of the old military standards or methods? That is the practical question. *Constructive work* in which are the same attractive elements as those offered by war. Professor William James has forcefully shown the compelling power of war, its fascinations, and the need to provide for not merely a substitute but an equivalent. August Comte holds that man seeks to improve his position in two ways "by the destruction of obstacles, or military action, and by the construction of means, or industrial action." What opportunities are found to-day for the cultivation of the heroic spirit? In constructive industrialism? In control of nature? In overcoming abnormal or evil social conditions?

**The Game of Welfare vs. the Game of Warfare**

Courage and endurance are evident in the industrial world. "Labor is the great conqueror. Not war but work is the great educator. It is not the men that give up fighting who lose stamina and virility but the men who give up work" (William Leighton Grane). "Let men work together at building the Panama Canal and conserving needed forests; at putting an end to malaria, yellow fever, tuberculosis, the white-slave traffic and child labor; at providing employment for all capable and willing workers and education in a trade for every boy and girl able to learn one. They will soon come to feel an honorable pride in their own race or nation, pride in what it achieves for its own and the world's good. They will find the game of welfare as interesting as the game of war. This is not a Utopian solution. The zest for vicarious war, for contemplating the conflicts of military 'teams,' has lived not so much by its intrinsic attractiveness as by heavy subsidies. Put a million dollars a day into any national enterprise, say a crusade against tuberculosis, and it acquires interest. Devote a large fraction of literary talent for two thousand years to advertising the adventures of a public-health army, and the career of a hunter of microbes will become attractive. The intrinsic difficulty of arousing interest in exterminating the *tubercle bacillus*, of freeing children from slavery, of putting Justice on the throne of industry, may not be greater

than that of arousing an equal interest in exterminating the aborigines, or freeing Cuba, or putting a Bourbon on the throne of France."

**The Value of Army Discipline**

William James says: "I do not believe that peace either ought to be or will be permanent on this globe, unless the states pacifically organized preserve some of the old elements of army discipline. A permanently successful peace-economy cannot be a simple pleasure-economy. In the more or less socialistic future toward which mankind seems drifting we must still subject ourselves collectively to those severities which answer to our real position upon this only partly hospitable globe. We must make new energies and hardihoods continue the manliness to which the military mind so faithfully clings. Martial virtues must be the enduring cement; intrepidity, contempt of softness, surrender of private interest, obedience to command, must still remain the rock upon which states are built.

"Men now are proud of belonging to a conquering nation, and without a murmur they lay down their persons and their wealth, if by so doing they may fend off subjection. But who can be sure that *other aspects of one's country* may not, with time and education and suggestion enough, come to be regarded with similarly effective feelings of pride and shame? Why should men not some day feel that it is worth a blood-tax to belong to a collectivity superior in *any* ideal respect? Why should they not blush with indignant shame if the community that owns them is vile in any way whatsoever? Individuals, daily more numerous, now feel this civic passion. It is only a question of blowing on the spark until the whole population gets incandescent, and on the ruins of the old morals of military honor, a stable system of morals, of civic honor, builds itself up. What the whole community comes to believe in grasps the individual as in a vise. The war-function has grasped us so far, but constructive interests may some day seem no less imperative, and impose on the individual a hardly lighter burden."

**The Martial Type of Character**

Distinction needs to be made between the doing away with war and the doing away with the admirable qualities of the martial type of character. The latter is not dependent upon the former. Figures of speech, analogies, and symbolisms were taken both by Jesus Christ and the apostles from the life of the times. Moral ideas had to be clothed in bodily form that the people would appreciate. Their Christian ideals had to grow out of the good ideas or mental pictures they already possessed. This would seem to be a sufficient reason for the warlike and soldierly terms found in the Bible. Should these be conserved to-day? Do the words, "The Son of God goes forth to war," or "Onward, Christian soldiers, marching as to war" express our highest ideals? The tunes to which these words are set give inspiration

for any noble struggle or any victorious effort, but the words suggest a mental imagery inconsistent with other moral teachings. To seek a spiritual ideal from what is realized to-day to be an immoral act or condition is a contradiction. Where, outside of the army and the navy, is the martial type of character and life found? Can you think of any soldier business men, or soldier scientists, or soldier professional men in your own community?

**A Good Soldier of Jesus Christ**

Paul says, "Suffer hardship with me *like* a *good* soldier of Jesus Christ," or in other words, "as a good soldier of Christ Jesus accept your share of suffering." The sterling qualities of the soldier are to be imitated, but are these found only in the soldier? "War does not create bravery, it only reveals it as existing. Heroism exists and would exist if there were no war, but heroism would find a nobler and more congenial sphere in which to exercise itself. Heroism would be employed in the arts of peace. Heroism would go to Africa to find Livingstone. Yea, it would be Livingstone. Was not Robert Moffat a hero? Yet he carried no sword but the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God. Was not Father Damien a hero? Was not Bishop Pattison a hero? Is not Duncan of Metlakhatla a hero? Heroism! There is as much heroism on the mission field as on the battlefield. The mission field is the true battlefield of the world. It demands more heroism to plod on in the teeth of all but insuperable difficulties, often alone and unaided, than to fight at Sedan or Gettysburg or Waterloo. There is as much heroism in human nature to-day as ever there was. It is too rare and valuable an article for heartless politicians to waste on battlefields. We may turn it in the direction of destruction, or in the direction of instruction and construction. We may use it to save men's lives or to destroy them" (Reuen Thomas).

**The Impulse of a Cause**

A striking illustration of a changing ideal is the fact that a recent vote taken in the Paris schools on the greatest hero of France placed Napoleon far down the list and named Pasteur as the true patriot of his country. The impelling power of a great cause needs to be realized. Make men feel the greatness of the undertaking, the grandeur of the outcome, and they will rise to the occasion. It is the really hard things that appeal most profoundly to human nature, and they appeal especially when there is faith in the final result. When Dr. Grenfell faces the frosts of Labrador and Newfoundland, note the response that his work wins from young men! He says, "The hero is not one who is never afraid but one who *being afraid* goes forward."

**The Aggressiveness of Faith**

A grand faith record of ancient heroes is found in the eleventh chapter of Hebrews. There is an aggressive quality in faith;

an *up*reaching to something above and beyond oneself, or an *out*reaching to a future good that is to be gained. In the first verse we are told that "*Faith is a conviction of the reality of things which we do not see.*" It was by this faith that the old-time heroes gained the victory and it is by this faith that heroes of to-day will conquer. It is this faith that gives us the ideal toward which we work. "The ideal condemns the actual," but it has faith in it or "appreciates it, in so far as the actual conditions lend themselves to betterment. There could be no ideal if the actual were not capable of being made what it ought to be" (Felix Adler).

**Paul the Hero**

It was for such an aspiration as this that Paul "suffered hardship as a good soldier" and gives his ringing testimony of his endurance for a great cause:

"For whatever reason any one is 'courageous'—I speak in mere folly—I also am courageous. Are they Hebrews? So am I. Are they Israelites? So am I. Are they descendants of Abraham? So am I. Are they servants of Christ? (I speak as if I were out of my mind.) Much more am I His servant; serving Him more thoroughly than they by my labours, and more thoroughly also by my imprisonments, by excessively cruel floggings, and with risk of life many a time. From the Jews I five times have received forty lashes all but one. Three times I have been beaten with Roman rods, once I have been stoned, three times I have been shipwrecked, once for full four and twenty hours I was floating on the open sea. I have served Him by frequent traveling, amid dangers in crossing rivers, dangers from robbers; dangers from my own countrymen, dangers from the Gentiles; dangers in the city, dangers in the desert, dangers by sea, dangers from spies in our midst; with labor and toil, with many a sleepless night, in hunger and thirst, in frequent fastings, in cold, and with insufficient clothing. . . .

"If boast I must, it shall be of things which display my weakness. The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ—He who is blessed throughout the ages—knows that I am speaking the truth" (2 Cor. 11: 21-31).

Who are the soldier Christians of the present generation? What are some of the non-military tasks that require soldierly qualities? It is said that 100,000 lives are lost in our country every year as a result of the liquor business. How can this waste be stopped? Tuberculosis is a preventable disease. How can the white plague be stayed?

## LESSON VI

## PREVENTIVES OF WAR

Study Matt. 18: 15-17; 1 Cor. 6: 1-6; Isa. 2: 2-4

### Arbitration a Christian Method of Settling Disputes

Wherever the Christian doctrine of love has taken root in human life, the usual method of settling differences between individuals has been by an appeal to reason. With the removal of hatred, envy, oppression, and jealousy, the difficulties that interfere with such a settlement are for the most part taken away. There is nothing in the Christian faith that blinds one's eyes so that he cannot see facts as they are and cannot accept a reasonable interpretation of them. If two men both having the spirit of Christ undertake to settle a question in dispute, they are not possessed of prejudices that interfere with the judicial weighing of facts or of evidence. The Christian faith, because of its insistence upon good will among men and its intolerance of destructive sentiments, creates conditions in which the appeal to reason is the natural method of settling differences between individuals. For here, mutual tolerance is found.

### How to Treat a Sinning Fellow Christian

In the Gospel of Matthew, Christ is represented as giving a vivid picture of how Christians should proceed in settling their personal differences. "If your brother acts wrongly towards you, go and point out his fault to him when only you and he are there. If he listens to you, you have gained your brother. But if he will not listen to you, go again, and ask one or two to go with you, that every word spoken may be attested by two or three witnesses. If he refuses to hear them, appeal to the church; and if he refuses to hear even the church, regard him just as you regard a Gentile or a tax-gatherer" (Matt. 18: 15-17).

### The Christian Appeal to Reason

The implications of these words are unmistakable. The first appeal should be to reason—not to force, and not to sentiment, and not even to a third party who is to act as judge. The individuals involved are first urged to come together in a spirit of deliberation. The facts are to be pointed out when only those directly concerned are present. If both are in a mood where reason is not interfered with, amicable adjustment results and the sentiment of brotherliness is not destroyed. If this attempt fails, a new factor is to be introduced into the negotiations. That is, a more careful substantiation of the facts is to be undertaken. Witnesses are to be brought in. The truthfulness of the

statements in the accusation is to be tested in the light of their testimony. This is a supreme appeal to reason. The accuser in his attempt to effect a settlement, is thus showing his readiness to rely absolutely upon the facts involved.

**The Christian Appeal to the Bond of Brotherhood**

If the accused party refuses to take account of the facts thus adequately verified, the supposition is that his attitude does not reflect the spirit of brotherliness which is a characteristic of all true Christians. So the next step is to bring him before the church, that is, before those in whose lives this spirit is enthroned and who are the representatives of Christ in the world. The appeal to reason remains as it was. That is, the facts are not altered. But they are enumerated in the presence of those whose attitude is that of conciliation and true brotherliness. It is as though Christ were now pleading for a settlement. This appeal includes the emotions as well as the reason. The one who will not listen to it has lost the Christlike spirit of kindness and good will. He has also lost the respect he should have for the cause of Christ as represented in the organization composed of believers in Him. Therefore, if he refuses to listen to this appeal he reveals the presence of an un-Christlike spirit. He is thenceforth to be treated as a nonbeliever or as one from whose heart avarice has crowded out true brotherliness.

**Love Your Enemies**

And yet even after it has become evident that a spirit of avarice as intense as that of the typical tax-gatherer or a spirit of unbrotherliness characteristic of the ancient "Gentile," has taken possession of the accused, the negotiations are not to come to an end by an appeal to force. Christ never taught his disciples to overcome the Gentiles by the use of the sword. The truly Christlike attitude toward publican or nonbeliever was never that of enforced subjugation. In suggesting that the one who refused to hear the church's presentation of a righteous cause should thenceforth be treated as a Gentile, Christ did not necessarily imply that the way had been absolutely closed to any future peaceful negotiations. His own attitude toward such individuals was one of loving hospitality. He commanded His followers to love their enemies. The true Christian bears the sins of others. He suffers losses in this world but is not unmindful of the fact that heaven has something to do with the transactions of earth.

**Litigation in Heathen Law Courts**

This Christian principle of conciliation and appeal to reason is clearly reflected in the writings of Paul. In the great apostle's letter to the Corinthians, he writes:

"If one of you has a grievance against an opponent, does he dare to go to law before irreligious men and not before God's people? Do you not know that God's people will sit in judgment

upon the world? And if you are the court before which the world is to be judged, are you unfit to deal with these petty matters? Do you not know that we are to sit in judgment upon angels—to say nothing of things belonging to this life? If therefore you have things belonging to this life which need to be decided, is it men who are absolutely nothing in the church—is it they whom you make your judges? I say this to put you to shame. Has it come to this, that there does not exist among you a single wise man competent to decide between a man and his brother, but brother goes to law with brother, and that before unbelievers?" (1 Cor. 6: 1-6.)

**The Humiliation of Appealing to a Heathen Law Court**

It is evident that Paul was jealously guarding the bond of love which should unite all true believers in Christ. He did not want differences among individual Christians to be permitted seriously to threaten that bond. Neither did he want non-Christians in Corinth to know that the principles laid down by Christ were seeming to be impracticable in their city. "Has it come to this, that there does not exist among you a single wise man competent to decide between a man and his brother?" Paul seems to think that in the problems that were apt to arise in the intercourse of one Christian and another, recourse to a heathen law court would expose the believers to humiliation and disgrace. A Christian "wise man" was his substitute for a heathen judge.

**Isaiah's Vision**

Slowly but surely the civilized world has been coming into possession of a clear vision of that time when the appeal to reason within the bond of brotherhood shall have been adopted not only by individuals but also by nations. The idea is not new. With the passing of the centuries, prophets have created visions out of ideas that belonged to their own times. Isaiah wrote:

"And it shall come to pass in the latter days, that the mountain of Jehovah's house shall be established on the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many peoples shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of Jehovah, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of Jehovah from Jerusalem, and he will judge between the nations, and will decide concerning many peoples: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more" (Isa. 2: 2-4).

**The Visions of Dante, Erasmus, and Others**

The present century has inherited other suggestive and inspiring visions. "Dante dreamed of a model emperor under whose

wise control all nations would dwell in peace. Marsilio of Padua thought of a universal democratic church, whose ecumenical councils might reflect a republican union of states. Erasmus marveled how Christians, 'members of one body, fed by the same sacraments, attached to the same Head, called to the same immortality, hoping for the same communion with Christ, could allow anything in the world to provoke them to war.' . . . The dreadful wars of the Reformation converted at least one calculating statesman into an idealist. The Grand Design of Henry the Fourth sprang, in all probability, from the brain of Sully, in whose memoirs it stands recorded, an imperishable monument of political sagacity. A treaty 'done at The Hague,' between Henry of Navarre, Elizabeth, and the Dutch Republic, was clearly intended to pave the way for this great League of Peace" (Francis W. Hirst, American Association for International Conciliation, 1909, pp. 3, 4).

**The Development of International Arbitration**

These Christian principles and prophetic visions, originating in other days, are now cherished as priceless spiritual treasures. In the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries they are receiving the serious, practical, and popular consideration of which they are worthy. In ancient times and among Oriental states where one state had to be supreme and all others subjugated by it, neither the direct appeal to reason by the contending parties nor the indirect appeal, through an arbitrator, played any important part in international relationships. The political history of Greece records seventy-five cases of arbitration. The Roman genius for conquest did not prove to be a favorable atmosphere for the development and application of this principle. In the mediæval period, with its private wars and its frequent challenge to arms for trivial and absurd causes, the instances of arbitration are relatively unimportant. The arbiters were the pope, the emperor, various potentates and cities. But the real influence of the Prince of Peace appears strikingly in modern times. Sects such as the Mennonites and the Quakers have opposed war because of religious convictions. Many individual peace advocates, such as Henry IV of France, Emerie Cruce, William Penn, Abbé de Saint-Pierre, J. J. Rousseau, Benjamin Franklin, and Immanuel Kant, have had a profound influence upon the statesmen of the last century. The Jay Treaty between the United States and England, 1794, involved the principle of arbitration and is "usually regarded as the first modern treaty of arbitration." Since that time France, England, the Netherlands, Italy, Sweden, Denmark, and Belgium have all adopted arbitration measures. "The establishment of the Interparliamentary Union (1889), and the initial success of the Pan-American movement, practically saw the triumph of the principles of arbitration of international differences. Since that time the question has been what the scope of arbitration shall be" (Krehbiel, Syllabus on the Development of International Arbitration).

**The Hague Conferences**

The influences tending in the direction of international arbitration crystallized in "the crowning event of the nineteenth century"—the Permanent International Court at The Hague (1899). Twenty-six Powers were represented. At the second Hague Conference, held in 1907, the representatives of forty-four Powers, including practically the entire civilized world, voted unanimously in favor of the creation of a "regular international court of justice with judges always in service and holding regular sessions. It failed to find a method of appointing the judges which would be satisfactory alike to the great and the small powers, but this difficulty will undoubtedly be surmounted in a comparatively short time" (Benjamin F. Trueblood, International Arbitration at the Opening of the Twentieth Century). The world-wide sentiment reflected in the deliberations of this conference had been developing with remarkable rapidity. If the eighty years from 1820 to 1900 were divided into four periods of twenty years each, the number of cases of international differences settled by arbitration are: eight in the first period; thirty in the next; forty-four in the third, and ninety in the last. What are these cases of successful arbitration but a trumpet-tongued challenge to all men and nations to hasten the day of reason's peaceful and universal rule? Who can predict the victories of the third conference at The Hague?

**Individual Responsibility and Public Opinion**

The individual believer in Jesus Christ and in His principle, appeal to reason within the bonds of brotherhood, may well ask himself the question—What is my part in this great undertaking of world organization? What is needed to hasten the reign of reason, to strengthen the bonds of national brotherhood, and to bring the unnumbered blessings that will flow from them? The direct and immediate dependence of International Arbitration and of national brotherliness upon public opinion is not yet appreciated by the individual Christian as it should be. In 1911 there was signed at Washington a treaty of unlimited arbitration between the United States and Great Britain. The plan of the administration was to make this the first of a number of similar treaties with other great powers. Sir Edward Grey and statesmen of all parties in England looked upon it with cordiality. But the Senate of the United States, *by a narrow majority, refused to ratify it.* Public opinion in the United States, as represented in the Senate, did not adequately support the proposed treaty. Christian men settle disputes between individuals by an appeal to reason and yet are content to let their own government settle international differences by an appeal to arms! They permit their own senators to defeat such a treaty as this. The great practical need of to-day is for a larger number of citizens whose convictions on this subject are thoroughly Christian and who will use their influence to elevate public opinion and to cause government officials to reflect that opinion. How is it possible

to meet this need? Upon whom does the responsibility ultimately rest?

**National Honor and Vital Interests**

At present, the great barrier to the adoption of Christian preventives of war is the fact that some nations are unwilling to submit questions which involve "national honor and vital interests" to an international tribunal of justice. "The reservation from arbitration of so-called matters of national honor and vital interest constitutes the weak link in every existing arbitration treaty between the great powers of the world" (Russell Weisman, National Honor and Vital Interests, p. 7). But why should not such matters be referred to courts of arbitration? Are they more difficult of adjustment, more intangible than matters of proprietorship or ownership? Are courts of arbitration not made up of men of honor? Do they not understand what is involved in national honor? Is it more honorable to fight for national honor than to let justice decide how the question should be decided?

**The United States Supreme Court**

Is it not true that interests that are vital to the welfare of the different states of the United States are submitted to the Supreme Court for adjudication? And has not the "honor" of many states been properly guarded in the decisions rendered by that court? If all of the interstate difficulties had been settled by appeals to arms, what would be the condition of military affairs in our nation to-day? Would its burden arising from the cost of armies and navies not equal that of Europe? The Christian ideal of honor in no way contradicts the Christian ideal of conciliation and arbitration. Jesus never taught that one's "honor" should be exempt from arbitration. His own honor was not injured because he refused to meet his enemies with an army of trained soldiers. In this nation, where His truth is nominally the guiding principle of life, there is not one boundary line between the various states that is protected by fort, arsenal, or watchful sentinel. The Supreme Court has been the preventive of war. Why cannot this principle of a supreme court be applied to the nations?

## LESSON VII

## THE INTERDEPENDENCE OF THE NATIONS

Study 1 Cor. 12

**Each Working for All and All for Each**

"If a cross-section showing a single day in the life of a civilized man could be exposed, it would disclose the services of a multitude of helpers. When he rises, a sponge is placed in his hand by a Pacific Islander, a cake of soap by a Frenchman, a rough towel by a Turk. His merino underwear he takes from the hand of a Spaniard, his linen from a Belfast manufacturer, his outer garments from a Birmingham weaver, his scarf from a French silk-grower, his shoes from a Brazilian grazier. At breakfast, his cup of coffee is poured by natives of Java and Arabia; his rolls are passed by a Kansas farmer, his beefsteak by a Texan ranchman, his orange by a Florida Negro. He is taken to the city by the descendants of James Watt; his messages are carried hither and thither by Edison, the grandson by electrical consanguinity of Benjamin Franklin; his day's stint of work is done for him by a thousand Irishmen in his factory; or he pleads in a court which was founded by ancient Romans, and for the support of which all citizens are taxed; or in his study at home he reads books composed by English historians and French scientists, and which were printed by the typographical descendants of Gutenburg. In the evening he is entertained by German singers who repeat the myths of Norsemen, or by a company of actors who render the plays of Shakespeare; and, finally, he is put to bed by South Americans who bring hair, by Pennsylvania miners and furnace-workers who bring steel, by Mississippi planters who bring cotton, or, if he prefers by Russian peasants who bring flax, and by Labrador fowlers who smooth his pillow. A million men, women, and children have been working for him that he may have his day of comfort and pleasure. In return he has contributed his mite to add a unit to the common stock of necessaries and luxuries from which the world draws. Each is working for all; all are working for each" (George Harris, in *Moral Evolution*, pp. 36, 37).

**Growth of Interdependence**

The changes due to the division of labor, to the facilities for transportation and communication, to a removal of what may be termed physical barriers have all effected political, economic, and social interdependence among the nations. A net-work of trade-routes, news agencies, business connections, political sympathies and social relationships has developed to such an extent

that if a break occurs at one point far-reaching and numerous disturbances are felt at others. Banking interests are so interwoven that the nations have come to be financially interdependent. In many important instances, exchanges of views between governments have been made before action has been taken; whereas in former days each would act without reference to the other. Commerce rests on the principle of reciprocity. Gladstone is quoted as saying that "The ships that pass between one country and another are like the shuttle of the loom, weaving a web of concord among the nations." If a country like Great Britain should attempt to live without cooperation with other nations, it is estimated that half of the population would starve. National vitality decreases as cooperation is restricted. Commercial cooperation leads to material expansion. How is it that social and intellectual cooperation is beneficial?

**Means for Connection**

Man's control of material forces has brought men nearer together in work and interests. Before the time of steam transportation few persons went outside of their own land. Electricity has overcome distance, and the modern press enables those in different lands to hear simultaneously of the same events. Workers in different lands are finding out that they have common interests irrespective of nationality. This is especially true of men of science: their investigations and discoveries lead to cooperative work, for in the interests and excitement of discovery one lends aid to the other. Universities in different nations exchange their professors. The International Institute of Agriculture is a striking evidence of international dependence for economic betterment. In 1905 a conference was called by the King of Italy for the founding of this institute. A treaty for its establishment was ratified by forty-seven governments and the adhering governments represent ninety-eight per cent of the population and ninety-five per cent of all the land of the world. The problem of creating one universal language for all the peoples of earth has been seriously undertaken by those who see the practical need of removing the barriers to international and interracial communication. The different peoples of the world have now so much in common that eighty official International Bureaus have been established with permanent offices to take up matters affecting the interests of the civilized world. Three hundred private international associations have been formed, and one hundred and fifty international congresses annually meet for the consideration of questions affecting the good of humanity. The numberless benefits that have already come from international and interracial relationship have shown clearly the interdependence of those nations that would reach their highest development. One practical example of interdependence has become so common a benefit that it is often passed by unnoticed. One puts a five-cent stamp upon a letter addressed to a person in a town in the interior of Europe. In accord with the

regulations of the International Postal Union this letter will, with expedition, be forwarded by the officials of the various States through which it passes until delivered to the person addressed; or, if he is not found, it will be returned to the sender. Such transportation has not been possible until recent times. What has been realized in the transmission of letters may be realized in other respects as the peoples of the world come to understand the possibilities and advantages of intelligent cooperation. Point out other illustrations of interdependence.

**Diversity in Gifts**

A breadth of appreciation that sees the value of differences needs to be cultivated. As with individuals so with nations, one may complement another by diversity of character and ability. These very differences result in a wealth of suggestion and a variety of production the benefits of which are world-wide in extent. A diversity of gifts increases the possibility of and profit from cooperation. For the greatest good in this direction, it is necessary to appreciate the differences and to be glad all people are not, for instance, Anglo-Saxons. It is well also to recognize that a distribution of various kinds of valuable possessions is an expression of divine justice. "He bestows his gifts upon each of us in accordance with his own will" (1 Cor. 12: 11). What a combination is presented by the Irish wit, the Scotch pathos, the English perseverance, the French vivacity, the German determination, to go no farther afield! A study of the Oriental and the Occidental and the diversity of gifts of each will be more fully suggested in a later lesson. How is it that interracial differences suggest the almost infinite range of capacities within one individual?

**The Contributions of the Nations**

Material contributions in the way of imports and exports from one country to another have already been illustrated. But imagine for a moment what it would mean to the world if every French contribution of the past or present should be taken away. How much would go if everything that is German should be lost? What would be the culture of the Englishman and the American under such conditions? Where would be the scientific discoveries on which our very life depends to-day? Where would be the music that is our inspiration? And what would be the world condition without the practical inventions of the Englishman on the one hand, and the great English masterpieces of thought and expression on the other? Strike out Italy, Greece, Egypt, as never having existed and what would become of painting and sculpture? Perhaps no one thought-development shows the united contributions of many nations as does that of philosophy, made evident by the fact that to master the subject to any extent requires a knowledge of several languages.

**The New Meaning of Nationality**

The development of civilization during the past century has

brought out clearly some of the contributions which the different nations can make toward the betterment of the race as a whole. With the rapidly widening modern commercial, social, and religious outlook, each civilized nation is finding out its own value as never before. Nationality is coming to have new and higher meanings. The fuller value of racial traits and possessions is becoming apparent. At the beginning of the nineteenth century no country had a great national industry that depended upon the prosperity of her neighbors, upon their being able to send goods and raw material as required. Even fifty years ago the motive back of the greater part of so-called foreign missionary work was pity rather than love. The "heathen" were judged in the light of their deprivations or deficiencies rather than of their present possessions and future possibilities. In what ways will increasing interdependence tend to stimulate patriotism and national loyalty?

**Future Contributions**

In the consideration of a growing interdependence and a consequent increasing vitality, it is well to think not only of past and present contributions but also of those of the future; to judge of the potential contributions of many nations as well as the actual. For how much will the peoples of the world depend upon Russia with its wealth of future possibilities? In the waking up of the Orient to relations with the outside world there are already signs of interdependence unthought of twenty or even ten years ago. So also with the continents of South America and Africa. These vast, extensive possibilities suggest infinite possibilities of intensive development. Because of poverty, hardship, and ignorance Italy has not made one fifteenth of the contributions to the welfare of humanity which God intends her to make. How many God-given talents of music, architecture, painting, and sculpture have never been realized. When each nation shall have received the full help of every other nation in developing its own material and spiritual resources, who can imagine the blessings which the future has in store for the human race?

**The Permanency of Life**

"To save your life is to lose it" (Matt. 10: 39), is true of a group of individuals as of a single one: to keep one's best to oneself, to live in isolation, is destructive. History tells the story of the Powers that sought to grasp all and give nothing; the Empire of Alexander the Great fell to pieces; the Empire of Napoleon the Great soon perished. "Struggle is only one phase of the law; deeper and more fundamental than any competition is the law of cooperation through all the orders of the world. Deeper than any possible battle of group with group is the law that the group that will not stand together, and stand with the other groups, shall ultimately lose its chance in the

unfolding cosmic order" (W. H. P. Faunce). The old word stands: "Not one of us lives to himself." In this there is no choice. Relationship is life; isolation is death. The choice rests in the matter of degree. The abundant life comes through interchange and cooperation, interchange of what is already acquired and cooperation toward what may be attained.

"There is no nation or people or individual which is not affected beneficially or prejudicially by the welfare or misfortune of all the world. A disaster from earthquake, from disease, from drought, from war, which falls upon any nation in these days affects the welfare of the whole world, in greater or less degree, and on the other hand the progress of thought, the spread of education, the advance of invention, the growth of production, and, indeed, all things which raise the moral and material welfare of any nation, bring in their train advantages to the whole race." How is it possible for individuals to cultivate a world outlook and a sufficiently broad human sympathy?

**The Historic Climb to God's Truth**

The wisdom which comes from experience and the knowledge gleaned from history helps one to appreciate the value of revealed and inspired truth as found in the Bible. In this wonderful record of the revealing Spirit of God are found truths that do not depend upon limited experience or narrow observation. Gradually and painfully the world is climbing up to the truth of God's revelation. In learning through costly, first-hand experiences, the great lessons of interdependence and cooperation, the nations are being prepared to appreciate what is implied in the Christian doctrine of unity.

**Nations Members of One Body**

In the twelfth chapter of First Corinthians there is given a word picture of ideal group relationships. Paul shows that if there is any vital connection in the parts that form a body or group, no one part can be independent of any of the others. One part may have a larger place and thereby a larger responsibility, but in so far as any part has any value, it has a contribution to make to the whole and must have a consequent recognition. The apostle makes a particular application of this truth and illustrates it in specific ways. Can the principle underlying his words be applied universally wherever there is a vital group? Does it apply to nations? A faith that holds to a fundamental relationship in humanity, a brotherhood of mankind, will accept the proposition that the nations are members of one body and no one can say to another, "I do not need you." "The law which binds man to man is in the last analysis identical with that which binds kingdom to kingdom, state to state, race to race. The law which prevails in a little province only is no law whatever" (W. H. P. Faunce). Of nations it may be said, that "God has arranged the parts in the body—every one of them—as He has seen fit." What reasons are there to believe that all nations

will have parts in the final Kingdom of God? Is any nation to be left out of the final consummation of Christ's vision?

**Unity Should Make Jealousy Impossible**

"The human body does not consist of one part but of many. Were the foot to say, 'Because I am not a hand I am not a part of the body,' that would not make it any the less a part of the body. Or were the ear to say, 'Because I am not an eye, I am not a part of the body,' that would not make it any the less a part of the body. If the whole body were an eye, where would the hearing be? If the whole body were an ear, where would the nostrils be? But, as a matter of fact, God has arranged the parts in the body—every one of them—as He has seen fit. If they were all one part, where would the body be? But, as a matter of fact, there are many parts and but one body.

**Unity Should Exclude Pride and Contempt**

"It is also impossible for the eye to say to the hand, 'I do not need you;' or again for the head to say to the feet, 'I do not need you.' No, it is quite otherwise. Even those parts of the body which are apparently somewhat feeble are yet indispensable; and those which we deem less honorable we clothe with more abundant honor; and so our ungraceful parts come to have a more abundant grace, while our graceful parts have everything they need. But it was God who built up the body, and bestowed more abundant honor on the part that felt the need, that there might be no disunion in the body, but that all the members might entertain the same anxious care for one another's welfare. And if one part is suffering, every other part suffers with it; or if one part is receiving special honor, every other part shares in the joy" (1 Cor. 12: 14-26).

**Working Together for Better Crops**

"If the leading nations can be brought together in any kind of cooperative work for the general good of the civilized world, such as the system of crop-reporting planned (the International Institute of Agriculture), the very fact of working together will tend to produce friendship and to make war hereafter impossible. It is probable that international unity will never come about by merely saying, 'Go to now, let us be united,' but it will come about by just this form of cooperative work for a useful purpose, without much immediate thought as to its future reactions in the field of international friendship" (Thomas N. Carver). What other human interests, besides good crops, are worthy of international cooperation?

**A New Sense of Solidarity**

"When you have a sense of solidarity that binds you with the other people of the world, then you will come to a peaceful settlement of international difficulties. I am one of those who believe that all the higher forces of humanity are working to-

gether; that the work of the philosopher, the work of the scientist, the work of the theologian, the work of the artist, the work of the legislator and of the jurist, all help to reach the goal" (Jean C. Braco). Why is it that these "higher forces of humanity" need to be religious forces? Can the work of the legislator, alone, lead to final world organization? If not, why not? What is the most secure basis of the new sense of the solidarity of the human race?

## LESSON VIII

## THE PRESENT NEED OF INTERRACIAL APPRECIATION AND GOOD WILL

Study Matt. 7: 1-5

### Christianity a Universal Religion

"The dispersion which began at Babel has ended on the banks of the Hudson and the Mississippi." The Genesis story pictures what has been; the Gospel story shows what is coming to be. The old world, and an earlier age, represent separation and a distinction of nationality: each nation has had its own place and its own language; the new world and the movements of to-day signify a coming together of all peoples. History reveals the influence of Christianity in making possible such a change. A study of the chief religions of the world shows that most of them are bound to the race and the locality where they originated. Buddhism and Islam are the only ones besides Christianity that show any expansive power irrespective of place and people. From its very beginning Christianity has had a world-wide mission. What words of Jesus prove this to be true? The races have come together in many respects. In what way will the spirit of Christ in his followers make it easier for peoples who are coming together to get along well with one another?

### The Father in All

From Paul's letter to the Ephesians comes the message, "One God and Father of all who rules over all, acts through all and dwells *in all*" (Eph. 4: 6). The Father dwells *in* the Jew, in the Italian, in the Negro, and yet are there not those who bear the name of Christian but who look with scorn and reproach upon the "Sheeny," the "Dago," and the "Nigger"? Is God the Father of those human aspects that are repulsive? Are they natural? Is it the intrinsic qualities or is it the superficial aspects that are made more striking because of being brought into contrast with others that are more pleasing and that make them unattractive? Is there a capacity for God-likeness in *every* one? If not, how can God be Father of all? If so, should anyone, because of his inheritance, be despised?

### Respect for Other Races

Respect for individuals grows when actual good qualities are known, or when it is seen that ideal characteristics are being realized. In looking at a man one may have a picture of that to which he will some day rise. The expression follows, "I have faith in that man." In other words, "I have an ideal that is

going to be realized in him." Is it possible to have such a faith without some respect? The respect may not be for what is evident to-day, but for what is latent *in* the man, that will be manifest to-morrow. What is the secret of the "friendships" made by the Social Settlement worker? How is such an appreciation possible of races as well as of individuals?

**Better Racial Understanding**

Race prejudice is due largely to a lack of knowledge of one people by another. Misunderstanding and ill feeling arise from ignorance. Some unfortunate characteristics may cover for the time being qualities that are really attractive. It is necessary to get acquainted in order to judge rightly, and often to appreciate favorably. How many persons who dislike the Jewish race, or the Slavic races, the Teutonic or the Celtic, have set themselves definitely to find out what is admirable or desirable in each of them? Consider for instance such questions as the following: Is it to the credit of the Jews that no one of the race is a beggar on the street? Despite the ignominy cast upon this race it has representatives in some of the most responsible posts in English and American life. To what is this due? To-day the lord chief justice of England is a Jew, so also is the President of the local government Board and a number of Jews are peers and members of Parliament. The Jewish schools for religious training show a thoroughness of instruction and a humanitarian training that is lacking in many Christian schools. Why is this?

**Superiority of Race**

What is the test of the superiority of a nation or of a race? Is it love of war and power of conquest? Sir John Macdonell suggests that if war be the test, then some time ago the Turk would have been superior. Is it wealth or material possessions? That is not the Christian test applied to individuals. If it is morality, the application of the test, he adds, might be somewhat startling. Modern "superior races" have not progressed much farther in their moral achievements in some respects than had the best of the early Spanish conquerors of Mexico and Peru. And the conscience of present day rulers is not much keener than that shown by a remarkable confession of one of these conquerors: "The said Yncas, governed in such a way, that in all the land neither a thief, nor a vicious man, nor a bad, dishonest woman was known. The men all had honest and profitable employment. The woods and mines and all kinds of property were so divided that each man knew what belonged to him, and there were no lawsuits. The Yncas were feared, obeyed, and respected by their subjects as a race very capable of governing. But we took away their land, and placed it under the government of Spain, and made them subjects. Your Majesty must understand that my reason for making this statement is to relieve my conscience, for we have destroyed this people by our bad examples. Crimes were once so little known among them that an Indian with one

hundred thousand pieces of gold and silver in his house left it and nobody went in. But when they saw that we placed locks and keys on our doors, they understood that it was from fear of thieves, and when they saw we had thieves amongst us, they despised us. All this I tell your Majesty to discharge my conscience of a weight that I may no longer be a party to these things. And I pray God to pardon me." What actions of England and of the United States may be put on the same plane with those of this ruler? What harm has come to the Indian as a result of his contact with the white man? Who is responsible for the moral degradation that resulted from the enslaving of the Negro?

**Appreciation of the Orient and the Occident**

It is not always easy to draw the line between progressive and non-progressive people because the "so-called stationary races are often merely those whose changes are unrecorded." There may be a slow and unperceived awakening that suddenly shows itself by leaps and bounds as in the case of China. There may be an exclusiveness but a quiet development of strength that circumstances suddenly reveal as in the case of Japan. In so far as the United States has shown interracial good-will to the Oriental there has resulted a growing appreciation on both sides, because both have had opportunity to know each other better. Such knowledge is more essential to-day than ever before and it can come only through the open door of good-will. "Asia is a sleeping giant," said Napoleon; "let her sleep, for when she wakens she will shake the world." That prophecy is now coming true. Events mighty and significant are crowding upon us. The situation is dramatic and threatens to become tragic. Man's modern mastery of nature with the practical collapse of space has created a new world situation. Races and civilizations, for ages self-sufficient, proud, ambitious, determined, are now face to face. Shall mutual misunderstandings, suspicions, aggressions, resentments, indignation, with mutual exclusion between East and West, grow ever more acute, culminating in fierce military conflict? (Sidney L. Gulick.) What can and should Christians do under such conditions? What can the United States as a people do?*

**Answers of the Japanese**

Supposing that the Japan of to-day is not on an equal basis with her white competitors? The Japan of to-morrow will be, in all probability. If, therefore, there is anything she has to teach them, it is the fact that mankind is a one and undivisible whole, that the yellow race is not inferior to the white, that all the races should cooperate in perfect harmony for the development of the world's civilization. Professor Nagai, in his article last May on the "White Peril," says: "If one race assumes the right

* For practical detailed answers see Sidney L. Gulick on "The Japanese Problem."

to appropriate all the wealth, why should not the other races feel ill used and protest? If the yellow races are oppressed by the white races and have to revolt to avoid congestion and maintain existence, whose fault is it but the aggressors? If the white races truly love peace and wish to deserve the name of Christian nations, they will practice what they preach and will soon restore to us the rights so long withheld. They will rise to the generosity of welcoming our citizens among them as heartily as we do theirs among us. We appeal to the white races to put aside their race prejudice and meet us on equal terms in brotherly cooperation."

**Signs of Progress**

The exchange of university professors between the Occident and the Orient indicates a mutual respect from the standpoint of scholars. Says one, "We wish America to send many more Mabies to interpret their nation to us and study things Japanese for their fellow citizens." To prevent ill will and danger of strife it is essential that Americans should understand better than they do the character of the Japanese.

**Illustrations of Appreciation**

Professor Ladd testifies "out of a full and long experience that Japan is not Oriental as are India and China and that permanent friendships may exist between individual Japanese and individual Americans to the advantage of both as between any two classes of individuals within either of the two nations. The singular beauty of character of certain Indian prophets and mystics is coming to be appreciated. The spiritual insight of Mr. Dharmapala has not been forgotten through the years by some who listened to him at the World's Parliament of Religions. Ian Maclaren says that "Chunder Sen, another Indian prophet, described Jesus' kingdom perfectly as 'a spiritual congregation of souls born anew to God.'" And Tagore, the Indian poet made familiar to many Americans by the award to him of the Nobel prize, has been revealed as an educational leader equal in thought and action to some of the strongest of our own leaders. What other instances are there of Western appreciation of Eastern leaders in educational or political life?

**Universal Race Congress**

A remarkable assembly met in London in 1911 known as the Universal Race Congress. Representatives of forty nationalities belonging to many races were there. English, Germans, Americans, and others of the white races sat down to luncheon with men and women of all shades of color. Learned Brahmans and Cambridge professors, French economists and Chinese diplomats, Turks, Egyptians, Persians and Russians, cultivated Negroes from America and South Africa, and an American Indian came together to study the future of interracial intercourse and the problems resulting from prejudice and ignorance.

**Appreciation Opens the Way for Christianity**

Because personal prejudice has been set aside and mutual respect established, John R. Mott has been able to reach large audiences of the *Literati* of China, when ten years ago he was told such a thing was impossible. With an appreciation of the best that is in the Oriental religions, missionaries are better able to carry to the adherents of these religions the greater light of the Christian faith. When the attitude of carrying the truth down to a heathen is changed for that of lifting a brother up until he makes a new discovery of truth, greater progress is made. Why will sympathy with what is good in anyone's faith be more likely to win a response to something better? Why is the attitude of absolute and entire opposition to or denouncement of another's religious belief apt to have bad results?

**Facts About the Chinese**

Students of Chinese life and character report that they are an able people, morally dependable, and intellectually keen, though held back by a narrow system of education centuries old and filled with superstition. They have certain mental and moral characteristics that the Western peoples might well acquire. Professor Ernest D. Burton says: "Chinese civilization is in some respects in advance of that of Europe and America. If we have something to impart we have also much to learn, and their assimilation of our civilization entire would be by no means an unmixed good. China needs the best we have to give in morals and religion. But the standard of commercial life is remarkably high. The reputation of Chinese merchants in the East is that they will keep a contract if it ruins them." Is a contract always as binding to business men of the United States?

**Sinners Must Not Judge Sinners**

How might the following advice of Jesus, given under conditions different from those under consideration, be looked upon as wholesome for to-day, especially for those who are afflicted with racial conceit? "Judge not, that you may not be judged; for your own judgment will be dealt—and your own measure meted—to yourselves. And why do you look at the splinter in your brother's eye, and not notice the beam which is in your own eye? Or how say to your brother, 'Allow me to take the splinter out of your eye,' while the beam is in your own eye? Hypocrite, first take the beam out of your own eye, and then you will see clearly how to remove the splinter from your brother's eye" (Matt. 7: 1-5).

**The Higher and the Lower Races**

It will be generally conceded that through the centuries of opportunity and the resulting hereditary influences, the white races are, in an all-round way, higher than the black or yellow races. Does that fact prevent their being complementary to each other? It is easy for those living in the Western world to see how much

natives of the East might gain from this more progressive life. But what has the Oriental to give to the American? Has he anything in art, in wisdom, in manners or in morals that the American lacks? What shall be said of the Ethiopian? Has the black man any desirable characteristic that the white man does not usually possess? In judging the American Negro there is a tendency to make comparison between him and the white man *on the same basis.* Is this just? What is the background of the one as compared with the other? Generations of intellectual and moral strength are behind the white man and are woven into the very fiber of the best of his kind. Look at the most advanced of the Negro race—Douglas, Washington, DuBois, Dunbar—and what is behind them? Considering the opportunities of the two races and the results achieved, what is likely to be the relative progress of the Negro race in the future? Has the black man shown his capacity for moral and economic advancement? This people will be a menace or a help to the United States according to the degree of the white man's good will.

**Superiority Brings Responsibility**

The difference between the races and the nations rests largely on the basis of nature *versus* nurture. "Is the superbly built, upstanding, high-browed Samoan of to-day a simple child of nature because he lacks capacity or because he lacks tradition and stimulus?" In other words, has he been deprived of opportunity? If the latter is true, superiority brings responsibility. The stronger nation must give to the weaker both for its own good and for that of the inferior people. Ex-President Roosevelt has said: "I believe that I am speaking with historic accuracy and impartiality when I say, the American treatment of and attitude toward the Filipino people, in its combination of disinterested ethical purpose and sound common sense, marks a new and long stride forward in advance of all steps that have hitherto been taken along the path of wise and proper treatment of weaker by stronger nations." In what ways can the Anglo-Saxon contribute to the development of the so-called backward races?

**"Come Over and Help Us"**

A weaker and more backward nation from a social or a religious standpoint may not realize its shortcomings. The call of "The Man of Macedonia" (Acts 16: 9) was not a cry of conscious need on the part of the people. As Phillips Brooks has pointed out, "So far as we can know there was not one man in Macedonia who wanted Paul—not one who met him at the ship and said, 'Come we have waited for you, we sent for you, we want your help.'" It was God's recognition of the need, and it was made real to Paul in the vision of a person. Alas for us if God helped us only when we knew we needed him! "Alas for us if every need which we know not, had not a voice for Him

and did not call Him to us! Did the world want the Saviour? Was it not into a blindness so dark that it did not know that it was blind, that the Saviour came? Think what the world would be if men were like God in this respect." To-day there is a cry of an unconscious need going up from the Ethiopian and the Caucasian, from the black man and the yellow man; yes, from the Jew and the Greek and many another "foreigner" who is neighbor to the Anglo-Saxon.

**The Need Is the Call**

The very recognition by the people of this land that there are those who are not their equal is in itself the "cry"—the call, the demand—to help them to a larger life, a better development, a realization of the "image of God," the capacity for which is the birthright of every man. The acknowledgment of superiority brings with it responsibility for those who are not as we are. "A man's obligation to the other man is measured by the need of the other man." (L. J. Birney.)

**Peace to Men of Good Will**

"We get a flash of illumination from that story in the New Testament related to the birth of Jesus. The shepherds watched their flocks by night and the heavens opened and the angels sang 'Gloria in excelsis Deo!' Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to men of His good will. That is to say, the men who have that divine good will shall have peace. According to this rendering, the song of the angels did not announce that peace should be bestowed upon all men indiscriminately—that presently there should be universal peace among men—but peace, conditionally to men who have the good will. This is my point, that good will in the strict sense is the engine upon which we must rely to create peace."

**Good Will in Practice**

"In the first place, every one of us, instead of writing letters to the newspaper as to what the Kaiser or the Czar or someone else should do, may begin to initiate the reign of peace by creating in himself good will, especially toward the people against whom he feels objection. Some object to colored people, some to Jews, some to Poles, some to the Japanese. Almost everyone objects to one or more other races, and many people object to all races other than their own. There are also individuals that repel us, there are those whose mere faces create in us dislike. We can begin by overcoming our personal repulsions, making it our ethical purpose, if we feel strongly repelled, to try and take a friendly view of a man, to try and see the fair side of his nature. Like Saint Francis in the legend, bathe your lepers, tend those who are repugnant to you. If there is anyone whom you particularly dislike, think kindly of him at this moment. He is your leper—see whether you cannot imitate Saint Francis and be in thought and deed his friend" (Felix Adler).

## LESSON IX

## WORLD FEDERATION A MEANS OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE

Study Psa. 92: 7-15

### A Nation's Ideal

Where can there be found a moral ideal that is worthy to set before a Christian nation? In Hebrew prophecy there is found such an ideal, only it was intended to be applied by individuals. Is it equally applicable to nations? "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth Jehovah require of thee, but to do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God?" (Micah 6: 8.) "Peace can never be, except as it is founded upon justice" (Elihu Root). What is just is the question to be raised and settled in every international dispute and claim. Resentment and animosity will be held in abeyance where there is a true appreciation of justice. With a desire for peace, it is most important therefore to study justice, what is involved in it, and how it may be obtained. How could such an ideal become firmly established in a nation?

### Cultivating the Sense of Justice

Before a government will be likely to act justly, before official representatives can be expected to urge justice, a moral sensitiveness must be cultivated in the State at large. An individual standard may be higher or lower than that of the group; a community standard is usually dependent on that of the majority of the individuals or the strongest of the leaders who form the group. Therefore individuals of the state must be educated so as to appreciate national honor and also what is involved in it, for national honor will not be upheld unless the people have a sense of what is honorable. Children have a keen sense of justice. What is fair is quickly appreciated by a child of six years in concrete matters with which he has to do. This keen sense needs to be conserved and strengthened as the years go on. Nothing calls for more attention in moral education, beginning with the rights of ownership, and the respect of persons in the home and the immediate community, and leading out to one's own country and other countries. Is justice instinctive? How does it come about that so many people and nations tolerate and practice injustice? How can an individual cherish moral ideals that are higher than those of his surroundings?

### The Rights of Others

What is justice? In particular instances it may be hard to

decide. But from a general point of view, it is a consideration of the rights of one as much as of another, and a resulting action on that basis. Justice between states is much more complex than justice between individuals. It is much easier to determine what is right toward one as compared with another, when circumstances and environment are the same in both cases than when they are different. For instance: "It would require a considerable training for an Eskimo to conceive of a proper application to an inhabitant of the tropics, of the injunction, 'Do unto others as you would that they should do unto you.'" Differences of class, rank, etc., affect the matter sometimes rightly, sometimes wrongly. What factors are there in the present world situation that make it especially urgent to have diplomats and statesmen whose attitude toward other races is that of good will?

**Some Practical Difficulties**

"The actions and thoughts of states are necessarily compounded of the actions and thoughts of individual persons." But statesmen *as statesmen* cannot always be as humane and just, as direct and quick in action as they would be when acting as private individuals. Much in relation to habit, prejudice, and the effects of the act in question has to be weighed in the balance to determine what is just. An illustration from the well-known conditions of slavery will make this clear.* "The great obstacles to the doing of things which make for peace have not been the wish of the diplomatists, nor the policy of the government, but the inconsiderate and thoughtless unwillingness of the great body of the people of the respective countries to stand behind the man who was willing for the sake of peace and justice, to make fair concessions" (Elihu Root). What are some of the other difficulties that stand in the way of international justice? How can they be solved?

**The Christian Guide**

Under one interpretation the Christian guide of the Golden Rule goes beyond strict justice. But when wishing rightly would any one wish others to do to him more than what is just? There can be no need of doing to others more than what would be right for them to do to oneself. Time is always needed for justice. One cannot put oneself in another's place without some consideration. Destruction, passion, and impulsiveness frequently interfere with just action. The Psalmist said: "Mercy and truth have met each other, righteousness and peace have kissed each other" (Psa. 85: 10). Is it always true that righteousness results in peace? Senator Hoar has set the standard of desire in his now famous saying, "May I never prefer my country's interests to my country's honor." For fear that that honor might be lowered he would go perhaps beyond the just to the generous action. Would public sentiment in the United States

*See William Whewell, The Elements of Morality.

support "generous action" on the part of its statesmen? Would national injustice ever be condoned?

**Just and Unjust Actions and Their Result Upon National Honor**

Single instances of magnanimity, for which any nation has a right to be proud, stand out in history—notably the reduction by the United States of China's indemnity after the Boxer trouble, its educating of the Philippines, and its more recent action in regard to the Panama tolls. No victory at arms can bring about such glory to England as that great act of justice when at a cost of one hundred million dollars she gave freedom to eight hundred thousand slaves. On the other hand in the eyes of many, a cloud has been cast on the honor of the United States by her treatment of the Japanese, and on the honor of England by her war with the Boers. While the world's sympathy may go out to Belgium, it is impossible to forget or to ignore the cruelty and inhumanity that characterized her treatment of her subjects living in the Congo state. The fact that such things as the above are noted to a nation's honor or to her shame is an evidence of a growing international conscience.

At the beginning of the present war, each nation tried to transfer the responsibility for its inauguration to the shoulders of some one else. Public opinion makes it harder than ever before for a great nation to ill-treat a little one. The protest that goes forth has its effect to the detriment of the wrongdoer. Frederick Lynch points out that the influence the United States has had with other nations has been due to her justice rather than her arms: namely, with Japan and Russia when at war; with China at the time of the Boxer disturbance, and with the Powers at the second Hague Conference. "The formation of the Pan-American Union in Washington and the building of the palace by Mr. Carnegie which is its home gave the United States more influence in South America than twenty new battleships would have done." Will God permanently prosper any nation that practices injustice? Is the prosperity of an unjust nation any more stable than that of a wicked individual? (See Psa. 94: 3-10).

**A Chance to All**

By what other means besides the raising of the ideal of the nation and the education of its people to a right standard can justice and peace be established? Appreciation of the contribution of each nation to the common good—of the smaller as well as the larger—will tend to this end. On the basis of what is fair, the stronger nation will let the weaker one have a chance. Until this is done it is impossible to tell how much a backward people can develop and what their contribution might be to the general welfare. In the interests of fair play, if a country needs more territory she will purchase it rather than fight for it; if she needs a port she will pay for it rather than seize it. Nicholas Murray Butler emphasizes the need of what he terms the International Mind, which he defines as a habit of thinking of and

acting in foreign relations on the basis that the civilized nations of the world are friendly and cooperating equals. "It is," he says, "inconsistent with this international mind to attempt to steal some other nation's territory, as it would be inconsistent with the principle of ordinary morality to attempt to steal some other individual's purse. Magnitude does not justify us in dispensing with morals." But is it as easy for a nation to be honest and just as it is for an individual? One of the arguments put forth in favor of war is that it has often been the means of securing justice or of resisting injustice. The futility of such reasoning is shown by the fact that it is not the one who is right who wins, but the one who is strongest. "If justice wins it is by accident."* Is it possible for one nation to act justly if others are bent upon injustice?

**Approach to World Federation**

The Federation of States is the most direct means for securing international justice. Federation, in this connection and in the fullest sense, signifies a juridical union between independent states for settling by peaceful and rational methods all questions of mutual interest. It goes a step beyond arbitration and toward international unity and justice. Arbitration presupposes arrangements that involve mutual tolerance; world federation, settlement by judicial decision. By the establishment of a World Court or Grand Jury, justice would be administered more certainly than by special commissions of arbitration. Reference would be made to law instead of to force. Lord Salisbury believed, with many others, some such federal union to be the only way to save the civilized nations of the world from the disaster of war. Such a tribunal would be composed of the highest judicial ability to be found in the states sharing in the federation. International law would be enlarged and made more beneficial to all participants in such a federation, and by this very means the instances requiring judicial settlement would diminish in number. The fact that leading statesmen and students of international law have even considered such plans augurs well for their development. How can public opinion in favor of World Federation be stimulated? What can be done to further it in our own nation?

**Existing International Federations**

The interparliamentary union is the most significant approach to federation because it is composed of parliamentarians who can view problems more clearly from an international standpoint than can other international organizations whose members are apt to have a limited national view. This union was organized in 1889, though it had been proposed as far back as 1875; it has a membership numbering more than three thousand and representing twenty-two nations. Ideals of peace and arbitration

*On this point see Hiram M. Chittenden, Brigadier General U. S. A., War or Peace.

first brought forward only by peace societies are now considered by this group of statesmen. It also urges that the voice of the people be expressed in regard to international relations.

**Rapid Growth of International Federation**

The growth of international federations for one purpose and another has been remarkable in recent years. The feeling of unity is manifested by the range of subjects in the interest of which they are maintained: including the sciences and arts, commerce and trade, education, crime, labor, philanthropies, and religion. The government organizations, such as the Postal Union, the Telegraph Union, the Union for Transportation of Merchandise, etc., show the need of international justice in regard to weights, measures, etc. Is it probable that these practical necessities will finally force the nations to arbitrate their political differences?

**Future Possibilities of Federation**

What are the possibilities of the Federation of States in the future? Citizens of a state can do much to develop the strength and scope of international law: they can influence those in authority to see that it controls separate nations just as the municipal law of a community controls its separate citizens. It would be useless for the governments to provide for tribunals for securing international justice if public opinion should not support such action. The people must be educated on these subjects to make federation possible. A remarkable instance of the interest in "International Brotherhood" was reported by the late Samuel B. Capen when in his recent visit to India he was requested to speak on this topic by leading Hindus in various places. Recent developments signify that the American world stands on the threshold of a new era. A leading representative of South America urges an "All American Peace Understanding" and a conclave of the American world proclaiming a new Gospel of Peace, of "All for all and each for the other." Can there be a true gospel of peace that does not recognize the Christian principles of brotherhood and of justice? Are the American nations sufficiently Christian to make it possible at present to enter into such a "Peace Understanding" as the one proposed?

**Evolving a System of Justice**

Theodore Marburg says: "The work of evolving between nations a system of justice such as obtains within the nations is still before us. We have still to lay down the principle that a wrong by one state against another is a matter with which the society of nations must concern itself; that the International Commission of Inquiry, like the grand jury in English Municipal law, must not stop with the inquiry but must evolve eventually a body which shall exist for the purpose of passing upon international wrong-doing, and must present the culprit for trial by a permanently constituted tribunal; that, in other words, the

society of nations, and not the individual nation, will set right an international wrong. Under such a system occasional miscarriage of justice may be expected exactly as in municipal law, but how insignificant will this be when compared with the wholesale injustice, private and public, which flows from war. So, too, must we expect an occasional war on a mighty scale when numbers of states shall be divided on a question, just as we have civil war to-day within the state; but such catastrophes should be increasingly rare." What reasons are there to hope that even this possibility might finally disappear? Some leaders advocate a voluntary association, an organization of free choice irrespective of accidents of birth, color, or residence. The Association State is to be a federation of those who voluntarily combine for mutual interests.*

**Evolution from Strife to Order**

Progressive thought gives a new conception of the state—not as a "power" but as a center of jurisdiction, in which emphasis will be placed not on the possibilities of enlarging its boundaries but on its function to maintain justice, peace, and prosperity within its borders. The history of civilization proves that strife has decreased, and order has become more and more established through the years. The Peace Movement stands for the substitution of law for war, for the development of order instead of strife. "It is all a question of evolution and the time of day. It is growing late to take the hell way to heaven. *To-day is to-day*, and *we are living in to-day. War was yesterday's way.* There's a new preposition creeping into the language, or rather, an old preposition creating new prefixes—the preposition 'inter.' It is coming into the language because its significance is coming into consciousness as never before—intercourse, intercommunication, interdependence, interstate, international, interracial even. These words and conceptions are growing familiar, and together they mean—World Peace is coming" (William C. Gannette). Is the progress of World Federation an evidence of the development of the Kingdom of God? After the Kingdom of God has been established will there be such a thing as World Federation as a means of international justice? What is meant by the Scripture passage "the Kingdom of God is righteousness and peace and joy and holiness of spirit"? (Romans 14: 17).

**The Permanency of Righteousness**

Christianity teaches that there is a permanency which belongs to righteous conduct which is greater than that of wickedness. Destruction is sure to come to those who disobey the laws of God. "When the wicked spring as the grass, And when all the workers of iniquity do flourish; it is that they shall be destroyed for ever; But thou, O Jehovah, art on high for evermore. For, lo, thine enemies, O Jehovah, for, lo, thine enemies shall perish;

* See T. Baty, International Law.

all the workers of iniquity shall be scattered. But my horn hast thou exalted like the horn of the wild-ox: I am anointed with fresh oil. Mine eye also hath seen my desire on mine enemies, mine ears have heard my desire of the evil doers that rise up against me. The righteous shall flourish like the palm tree; He shall grow like a cedar in Lebanon. They are planted in the house of Jehovah; they shall flourish in the courts of our God. They shall still bring forth in old age; they shall be full of sap and green: to show that Jehovah is upright; He is my rock, and there is no unrighteousness in him" (Psa. 92: 7-15). What aspects of society would become more permanent if there were formed a World Federation in the interest of justice as opposed to force?

## LESSON X

## THE PEACE MOVEMENT AND OTHER PEACE AGENCIES

Study Mark 4: 26-32

**Educating Public Opinion**

The power of public opinion, issuing in the common will and social custom, will be emphasized in a later lesson. Before taking up that subject there should be considered the education of public opinion that it may will and act in ways that are right. How is it possible to get a clearer understanding of affairs as they now are, that opinion may be formed on the basis of intelligence and of keen moral sense? Four things are necessary to reach this end: first, to foster respect for those exalted human sentiments which are found in the Declaration of 1776; second, to develop a just appreciation of international rights and duties; third, to spread a knowledge of the principles and rules of international law; fourth, to cultivate the true Christian spirit of interracial brotherliness. The four great channels for doing these things are the pulpits, the university courses, the newspapers and magazines, and the study classes. The opportunities are many to-day for a more rational understanding of peace and war through the several organizations that are putting forth effort to this end. "When the people want peace, they will have peace; when they want war, they will have war, and they are likely to want that of which most is sung and written and spoken. The more we talk about peace the less our chance of war" (Rear-Admiral C. F. Goodrich).

**Education of Youth**

The greatest asset for the future is in the education of youth on this matter. If a standard different from the present one should be raised in schools and colleges the next generation would not see war. The idea of, and the ideal for soldierly characteristics have been emphasized in song and exercise; the events of war have been studied and the glories of victory made vivid; speakers have addressed schools on war reminiscences, but who has shown the values of peace? Would a discussion or debate on the following question have a moral value for high school students: "Have the wars of recent centuries been necessary or useful to mankind?" Heroism and the glory of self-sacrifice for a worthy cause need to be inbred into the fiber of youth, but there is a heroism unstained by blood or by the suppression of the weak by the strong, that has been largely passed by in schools and school-books. What is necessary before the right interpretations of history can be introduced into our

schools? What has public opinion to do with the matter? Does a voter meet his full responsibility simply by voting for members of the School Board?

**Heroes of Peace**

Milton was right when he said: "Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war." Would you give your boy the most inspiring hero stories of to-day? Tell him the stories of Craig and Ross, who gave up their lives in Cuba that the ghastly yellow fever might be disarmed. Tell him of that young rector in New Orleans who, when the storm had again overflowed the cisterns and filled the streets with water, giving new life to the insidious mosquito, rallied his forces again under the motto, "Wear a flower in your buttonhole and a smile on your face and go to work again." Tell him of Billy Rugh of Gary, the poor crippled newsboy who gave the skin from his own limb to save the life of a young woman whom he had never known, the sweetheart of another. The sweetheart lived but the boy died. "Greater love hath no man than this, that he lay down his life for his friends." Tell your boy of the wireless operator in midocean who flashes into space his C. Q. D. while the ship is sinking. Tell him of the "hello girl" at the switchboard in the upper story who sends the message that outspeeds Paul Revere—"The dam is broken, flee for your lives"—while the devastating current is sweeping beneath her own feet. Tell your boy the story of Captain Scott, writing away with his frozen hand on the record of the brave triumph that overcame the dismal solitudes of the South Pole—writing and writing to his death. Tell your boy of that brave comrade of Commander Scott who said, "I am going to take a little walk," as he passed out of the tent, knowing he would never return, that the scanty supply might go the farther in sustaining the remnant of that brave band in the Antarctic desolation" (Jenkin Lloyd Jones).

**Constructive Workers**

Besides these special instances of heroism young people should be made familiar with continued work done for the world's betterment and with lives of patient devotion to a great cause. There is the work of peaceful explorers of whom Livingstone will serve as a great example; the work of industrial pioneers, in railway-making, cable-laying, the construction and care of light-houses and the patroling of the coast, the labor of mining, forestry, etc.; the work of great-hearted missionaries who besides giving themselves to religious teaching have helped forward civilization and peace; the work of women in social service, such as Elizabeth Fry, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Baroness Von Suttner, Jane Addams, and many others; the work of scientific discoverers such as Galileo, Newton, Edison, Burbank, Lister, Pasteur, Röntgen, and Ross. It is difficult to single out the few from the many of the world's peace heroes and benefactors. Do you know, personally, of such examples of heroic "constructive workers"? To whom

do the people of your community look up with greatest appreciation and highest regard? Who are the local heroes? Does your community appreciate its real heroes?

**Friendship of Nations**

In both the day school and the Sunday school there should be cultivated interracial good feeling. Boys and girls should be trained to a right appreciation of "the stranger within our gates," to note those qualities of the Jew, the Russian, the Italian, or the Japanese that are superior to those of the Anglo-Saxon. A commandment excellent for the public school and the religious school is that old one given originally to the Jewish people: "If a stranger sojourn with thee in thy land thou shalt not do him wrong." Instead of teaching children to dislike the English people, for instance, they should be taught that Americans could not be what they are, but for their English heritage, and that of all people they are nearest to ourselves in kinship, language, and customs. What would you say of a person who gives money to support "foreign" missionaries, but who would not, under any circumstances, undertake to teach a Chinese living nearby the English language or to teach a mother in a local Italian home how better to take care of her children?

**History from a New Viewpoint**

What would be the effect if in the teaching of history, textbooks should show war as a calamity, as destructive in its outcome, and should record and emphasize the great arbitrations as well as the great battles, the successful peace-makers as well as the successful warriors? A change is already apparent, in that less space and time than in earlier days is now devoted by books and teachers to the study of the periods of war and more to the general progress of a nation. But a different point of view is needed in the presentation and the study of history. How is it possible for teachers, preachers and parents to bring about this change? How does a genuine Christian faith help one to understand the story of advancing civilization?

**American School Peace League**

*There are forces quietly at work for creating a new standard in regard to war and peace. Instead of thinking, Blessed is the victorious Conqueror, public opinion will join in saying "Blessed are the peacemakers." "The American School Peace League" was organized some years ago and has been carried on largely through the ability of one woman and the generosity of another, for the purpose of the instruction and the cooperation of the growing generation in the cause of peace. The National Education Association has indorsed the principles and efforts of this organization, by appointing a special committee to cooperate with it.

* It is suggested that in the study of the following organizations for the promotion of peace, different members of a class obtain and contribute information regarding these movements.

**Intercollegiate Peace Association**

Still more important as far as direct action and study of the subject are concerned is the work done in the colleges and universities. The Intercollegiate Peace Association includes colleges in sixteen states of this country: it seeks to promote organized activities among students and educators in support of international arbitration and the peace movement. A memorial from this association was offered at the second Hague Conference representing twenty-two thousand students and sixteen thousand teachers. While individual students in large numbers will not trouble themselves with more than a surface investigation of the subject involved, the great gain through such means as this is in the enlistment of intelligent sympathy.

**The Christian Students' Federation**

In the Federation of Christian Students there is a great international force. Its leader and general secretary, John R. Mott, has been in forty-four countries during twenty-five years of service, and its members are led to a definite realization of the brotherhood of man through the breadth of the Federation and its meaning. The international conventions, conferences, and committees, all working in the interest of the advancement of the Kingdom of God, have resulted in the forming of close personal ties among Christian leaders in all of the leading nations. The movement has been characterized by mutual appreciation and high personal regard among these leaders. Thus strong men of many different nations have learned to respect and trust and pray for each other.

**The Cosmopolitan Clubs**

The Cosmopolitan Club is a movement among the students of the United States who are particularly interested in interracial affairs. It unites in a league of brotherhood students of every race, color, and creed and assumes all races and peoples to be on a footing of equality. It had its origin in the fact that of recent years thousands of Orientals, Latin-Americans, and Europeans have entered the schools of learning of this country. It is reported that in ten years the number of foreign students in the University of Wisconsin increased from seven to one hundred and seven. Such an increase is typical of every large American University. A National Association of Cosmopolitan Clubs was founded in 1907; it has a membership of over two thousand, representing sixty different countries; two years later an affiliation was made with the *Corda Fratres*, an international federation of students, so that a large door is open for interracial cooperation among the student bodies of the world. The motto of this association is: "Above all Nations is Humanity." Its purpose: "To bring together college young men from different countries, to aid and direct foreign students coming to the United States, to cultivate the arts of peace and to establish strong international friendships."

### The Growth of the Seed

The familiar parable of the grain of mustard seed, to the development of which the Kingdom of God is likened, is a good illustration of the growth of the peace movement as a part of that kingdom. Jesus said, as recorded in Mark 4: 26-32, and translated by Weymouth, "The Kingdom of God is as if a man scattered seed over the ground: he spends days and nights, now awake, now asleep, while the seed sprouds and grows tall, he knows not how. Of itself the land produces the crop—first the blade, then the ear; afterwards the perfect grain is seen in the ear. But no sooner is the crop ripe, then he sends the reapers, because the time of harvest has come." Another saying of His was this: "What is the Kingdom of God like? and to what shall I compare it? It is like a mustard-seed which a man drops into the soil in his garden, and it grows and becomes a tree in whose branches the birds roost" (Luke 13: 18, 19).

### The Development of the Peace Movement

When was the seed of peace planted? For long years it was buried. *The first unfolding of the idea of international peace in any full sense is to be noted in the seventeenth century. Four events occurring at that time in four different countries, and as the work of four eminent men, have been called "the cornerstones of the structure of modern peace work." The first of these was the Great Design of Henry IV of France for the federation and peace of Christian Europe. The second was the famous book of Hugo Grotius, "On the Rights of War and Peace," in which he pleaded for arbitration and his arguments made a deep impression upon Europe. The third great work for peace was that of George Fox who instituted the Society of Friends, which to this day has held a high ideal of universal peace before the world. William Penn's "Holy Experiment in Government on Peace Principles" was the fourth of these events; this practical experiment lasted more than fifty years and continues to have its moral influence. The end of the eighteenth century gave the world Kant's great treatise on "Perpetual Peace"; in this "was uttered for the first time the idea of a federation of the world in an international state built upon republican principles." The movement for the abolition of war and that for human liberty went hand in hand at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The names of the idealists and practical workers for peace of that time are many. The first International Peace Congress, initiated by the American Peace Society, was held in London in 1843 with some three hundred persons in attendance; five years later a second was held in Brussels, and the following year a third in Paris with two thousand delegates attending. In this pioneer work Elihu Burritt, "the learned blacksmith," was a recognized leader. The first resolution in favor of the principle of arbitration passed

* For an interesting historical outline of the Peace Movement see extracts from Benjamin Trueblood.

by any government was that by the House of Commons in 1873 through the efforts of Henry Richard, who for forty years was secretary of the London Peace Society and for twenty years a member of Parliament.

**Peace Movement in the United States**

From the planting of the seed in this country by a small group of pioneer workers in the early part of the last century, the work of the peace movement has gone steadily forward until in recent years it has spread its branches far and wide. The American Peace Society, founded by William Ladd in 1815, from its headquarters in Washington seeks to influence legislation in favor of arbitration and international good will; it organizes the American Peace Congresses, carries on a lecture bureau and library, and issues a paper, "The Advocate of Peace," as well as a large amount of other literature. It cooperates with the International Peace Bureau at Berne, the Associations for International Conciliation, the World's Peace Foundation, and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. The World Peace Foundation developed from the late Edwin Ginn's idea of an "International School of Peace" and is supported by his generosity. He was the first man to give a large amount of money to the propagating of peace; his gift made provision for $50,000 a year and an ultimate endowment of $1,000,000 for the Foundation. Its special purpose is educational; it has a department for work in colleges and universities; it aids the School Peace League and cooperates with the students' organizations. The Foundation publishes "The International Library," which includes some of the most important writings on peace, and it supplies much printed material for use in the study of the subject. Soon after Mr. Ginn's endowment a gift of $10,000,000 was made by Andrew Carnegie to establish the Carnegie endowment for International Peace. With headquarters in Washington and under the leadership and control of able statesmen and business men, it devotes itself largely to investigations through commissions on international law, the causes of war, etc.

**The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America**

The common conscience and message of thirty Protestant denominations on the subject of interracial brotherliness is being voiced through the work of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. This work is being carried on by three significant commissions called the Commission on Peace and Arbitration, with Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, Secretary, and Rev. Sidney L. Gulick, Associate Secretary; Commission on Relations with Japan, with Rev. Sidney L. Gulick as special representative; and the Commission on Christian Education, with Rev. Henry H. Meyer as Secretary. The first of these commissions has been active in urging the observance of Peace Sunday, in cooperating with various relief agencies and in creating the World Alliance of the Churches for Promoting International Friendship. The

second conducted a careful investigation of the Japanese situation. Professor Shailer Mathews and Rev. Gulick were sent as its special ambassadors to Japan, to convey the good will of the American churches. The third, through its special committee on Peace Instruction, has issued a course of lessons on International Peace, a Study in Christian Fraternity, which has been widely used. The Federal Council, through its commissions, is cooperating with the Church Peace Union and other agencies, to the end that its constituency of 17,000,000 members may become increasingly effective in opposing war and that the American nations may point the way to worldwide tranquillity among the nations.

**The Church Peace Union**

In February, 1914, Mr. Andrew Carnegie transferred to a board of twenty-nine trustees, representative of several denominations, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, the munificent sum of two million dollars. The foundation thus created is known as the Church Peace Union. Thus there was established a union of the churches, devoted to the abolition of war. In addressing the trustees Mr. Carnegie said: "I entrust this great mission to you, believing that the voice which goes forth from the united churches of the world against war and in favor of peace is to prove the most powerful voice of all." The officers elected were: President, Rt. Rev. David H. Greer, D.D.; vice-president, Rev. William Pierson Merrill, D.D.; secretary, Rev. Frederick Lynch, D.D.; and treasurer, George A. Plimpton, Esq.

**The Peace Movement and the Kingdom of God**

The Kingdom of God is like a planted seed. It grows gradually and thus, finally, it comes to maturity. The history of the peace movement shows that the seed has already been planted and that its branches are spreading around the world. It is not merely *like* the Kingdom of God. It is a vital part of that Kingdom. Until wars shall have come to an end, the reign of righteousness, peace, and joy cannot be ushered in. The spirit of love, of mutual confidence, and kindly regard must gradually win its way over that of hatred, mutual distrust, and the harsh use of force. To work for the ultimate triumph of peace is to work for the Kingdom of God, for it is one of the aspects of that kingdom—one of the forms under which it will appear. God is in this movement. His unfolding purpose is becoming more and more manifest. It is on earth and among men that this kingdom is to be established. How is it that the religious motive helps one to become an advocate of lasting peace? Why is it necessary to have a religious motive back of the peace movement? How may it be known that God is interested in the ultimate establishment of peace among the nations? Do you know of any instances where the advocates of peace have been treated as though they were visionary and impracticable? Were the apostles so treated? In what ways is Christianity now helping on the whole peace movement?

## LESSON XI

## THE SOCIALIZING OF CHRISTIANITY: THE SPIRIT OF CHRIST PERMEATING THE NATIONS

Study Matt. 25: 31-46

**Contrasts in the Socializing of Christianity**

Sir Charles Warren, Governor of Natal, after studying, at close range, the spirit of hostility that had become intense among the people over whom he ruled, said: "For the preservation of peace between colonists and natives one missionary is worthy a battalion of soldiers." Some of the people living in the neighborhood of the Hull House Settlement, Chicago, of which Jane Addams is the head, were once overheard saying: "We will have Saint Jane's Christ, but not the Christ of the Christians." Two very important facts are here brought out, namely, the Spirit of Christ, when expressed sincerely, in the conduct of His followers, strengthens the social bonds between those followers and their neighbors. But no amount of mere profession to be His disciples can take the place of genuine Christian conduct. Hypocrisy destroys the social bonds.

**The Essence of the Social Movement**

Are the teachings of Christ practicable or impracticable? If the latter, why do we call Him a great teacher? The social movement is the greatest movement of the last twenty years. It is a practical expression of the life of love, a life lived for others as well as for self, and this is the keynote of Jesus Christ's teachings. All the law was summed up in "Thou shalt love"—God and thy fellow-man. This attitude, or life of love, has been and is now expressed by individuals; it is being expressed by groups in community life. It is because so many people are living the Christian life sincerely, and because they are beginning to cooperate in their service of good will, that there has come to be a social service movement. But this number of individuals is not yet great enough. The true Christ spirit has yet to be expressed by nations in a definite and connected way. This means simply that either there are not enough individuals who really believe in the Christian way of doing things or else that such individuals lack sufficient cooperation for this life of love to be applied on a national scale. The rapidly multiplying number of Christians who are true has affected civilization in many directions. The day will come when the Christlike spirit will have dominated the conduct of a majority of the individuals in so many nations that wars supported by unchristian motives will have become impossible. Why is it reasonable to suppose

that national conduct can be as truly Christian as individual conduct? If the Spirit of Christ strengthens the social bonds between individuals, why not between nations? What is national hypocrisy? Give modern illustrations of so-called Christian nations the "conduct" of which has been unchristian.

**Social Custom More Than Law**

"The Church of Christ cannot make laws but it can make customs." Walter Rauschenbusch brings to mind the old saying "*quid leges sine moribus?*"—Of what avail are laws without customs? "Our two words, 'morals' and 'ethics,' the one from the Latin and the other from the Greek, both mean that which is customary. The law is a moral agency; . . . it furnishes the stiff skeleton of public morality which supports the finer tissues, but these tissues must be deposited by other forces." The spirit of Christ permeating through social customs will form the finer tissues preventing war. The moral impulse of the common will of organized society is the force that is greater than international law, though law may be the transmitter of that common will. On the one hand, there is the tribunal of law, on the other, the tribunal of the individual conscience. In between these is an influence that is greater than either for which the English language has no one word, but which the Germans express in "Sittlichkeit," implying custom and a habit of mind and action. It has reference to "those principles of conduct which regulate people in their relations to each other, and which have become matter of habit and second nature at the stage of culture reached, and of which, therefore, we are not explicitly conscious." If a custom that is contrary to a civic law becomes permanently established, what will ultimately become of the law? How would an international custom affect an international law that should stand opposed to it?

**Social Conscience Illustrated**

A careful student of "social conscience" has said that a man may be impelled to action of a higher order by his sense of unity with the society to which he belongs, action of which, from the civic standpoint, all approve. What he does in such a case is natural to him, and is done without thought of reward or punishment; but it has reference to standards of conduct set up not by himself but by society and accepted by him just because society has set them up. This principle is illustrated by a character described in a poem by Sir Alfred Lyall. An Englishman has been taken prisoner by Mahometan rebels in the Indian Mutiny. He is face to face with a cruel death. They offer him his life if he will repeat something from the Koran. If he complies, no one is likely ever to hear of it, and he will be free to return to England and to the woman he loves. Moreover, and here is the real point, he is not a believer in Christianity, so that it is no question of denying one whom he considers to be his Saviour. What ought he to do? Deliverance is easy, and relief and ad-

vantage would be unspeakably great. But he does not yield. Even when he hears his fellow-prisoner, a half-caste, pattering eagerly the words demanded, he remains true to the religious ideals of his nation. As an individual, he is held by the influence of the society of which he is a part. Picture the situation where the majority of the members of a certain society are opposed to war, but where certain scattered individuals are in favor of armed hostility. Will there always be such individuals, who will be compelled to yield to the social will?

**The Common Welfare**

Three great forces in society are moving to this end.* Business interests, laborers, and woman. Merchants are generally opposed to war. Mr. Carnegie has said that if any controversy arose between Great Britain and the United States it could be intrusted to the merchants of London and New York, who would settle it peacefully and with honor to both nations. The labor party and labor unions have continually declared in favor of peace. Keir Hardie, the leader of that party in the English Parliament, stated some time ago that the laborers of the world were all opposed to war. Woman has been and always will be against war: the more actively she engages in world interests, the more will she oppose war from the standpoint of the home and of society at large. She is now actively interested in the proposition of a Peace Congress and other instrumentalities looking toward permanent peace. One of the latest movements is among the women of the churches. It seeks to emphasize Christian ideals of peace; its purpose being expressed in the following terms: "We do not propose to enter into the political side of the question, but will confine our efforts to a peace propaganda based on the teaching and spirit of Jesus. We submit no elaborate program, but we will promise to enlist individuals and societies to pray for an end of war. We will teach the children in our homes and churches Christian ideals of peace and heroism. We will study the New Testament and accept its teachings concerning peace. We will endeavor to promote the understanding and friendliness of the nations by thinking of none as alien, but all as children of our Heavenly Father." Why is it that business men are opposed to war? Is it because of selfish motives that labor organizations object to the settlement of international difficulties by appeals to organized force?

**Increasing Christian Social Consciousness**

An ideal that has become actual even to a small degree, that has passed from individual to community group, and from community group to nation, will not stop at national borders, but will go on until it becomes an international reality. If the higher moral sense awakened in the United States in recent years increases, it must affect other nations whose standards are not on

* For fuller discussion of this point see Justice David J. Brewer, the Mission of the United States.

the same plane, for "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." A great change is visible* "to any one who watches the life of this nation with an eye for the stirring of God in the souls of men. There is a new shame and anger for oppression and meanness; a new love and pity for the young and frail, whose slender shoulders bear our common weight; a new faith in human brotherhood; a new hope of a better day that is even now in sight. We are inventing new phrases to name this new thing. We talk of the 'social feeling' or 'the new social consciousness.' We are passing through a moral adolescence. When the spirit of manhood comes over a boy, his tastes change. The old doings of his gang lose interest. A new sense of duty, a new openness to ideal calls, a new capacity of self-sacrifice surprise those who used to know him. So in our conventions and clubs, our chambers of commerce and our legislatures, there is a new note, a stiffening of will, an impatience for cowardice, an enthusiastic turning toward real democracy. The old leaders are stumbling off the stage bewildered. There is a new type of leaders and they and the people seem to understand one another as if by magic. Were you ever converted to God? Do you remember the change in your attitude to all the world? Is not this new life which is running through our people the same great change on a national scale? This is religious energy, rising from the depth of the infinite spiritual life in which we all live and move and have our being. This is God." Why is it that in the twentieth century there is this new and intelligent appreciation of Christianity? Is Christianity thus socially applied stronger or weaker as a peace agency than it was when the emphasis was placed upon mere individual belief? Why?

**The Unifying Influence of Religion**

Is it true to-day that "Religion is the Divider of Mankind?" What concrete illustrations can be given of its unifying effect? Why is the increase of the federation of the churches one evidence of the socializing of Christianity? The fact that to-day there is a Federal Council of the Churches of Christ representing thirty-two denominations weakens the statement that "Religion is the Divider of Mankind"? The fact that recently the three churches of one town, a Baptist, a Unitarian, and a Congregationalist, observed together a Communion Service in Passion week, and that one deacon from each church served the sacraments is one of many illustrations of its kind, and shows that the time is advancing when "they shall all be one." It is for the united church to socialize the Spirit of Christ among the nations. What will be the effect of this rapidly developing spirit of mutual friendliness among the churches, upon the Peace Movement?

**Responsibilities of a Christian Society**

Society as a whole, and therefore the Christian groups form-

*Walter Rauschenbusch, Christianizing the Social Order.

ing a part of society, are responsible for the injury of any individual who forms a part of the whole: for the baby who dies in its cradle, and the child who is made old by labor, for the youth who is killed by consumption, and the young girl whose purity is destroyed, for the degenerate who becomes a criminal and the soldier who is crippled for life, for the mother whom a battle robs of her son and for the widow and the orphans made such by a government's continuation of war. Society ruled by the Spirit of Christ cannot shift responsibility for any and for all of these things.

**Expressions of Love for Humanity**

A Bureau of Child Welfare, playground associations, open-air sanitariums, social settlements, and hundreds of other preventive means show a recognition by the state and the community of such responsibility. Many are the evidences of the concern of Christendom regarding the present European war and many are the efforts for ameliorating its horrors. The contributions that have poured in from far distant peoples for the aid of the sufferers indicate the bond of humanity felt to-day more strongly than ever, and will strengthen that bond for the years to come. "The Christmas ship" sent from the United States served as a concrete expression of the Christ spirit. The "Red Cross" stands out as the glory of the age, *so long as war has to be*, but the humane feeling that originated and perpetuates it will surely seek to reduce the occasion for its existence. Amelioration must be followed by prevention in war *as in other social relations.* "If the church cannot be content to be a mere ambulance corps of civilization it must be ambitious to carry over into international politics those principles which are fundamental in its religion" (Shailer Mathews).

**"The Sheep and the Goats"**

How do these expressions of the spirit of human sympathy compare with those referred to by Christ in the following:

"When the Son of Man comes in His glory, and all the angels with Him, then will He sit upon His glorious throne, and all the nations will be gathered into His presence. . And He will separate them from one another, just as a shepherd separates the sheep from the goats; and will make the sheep stand at His right hand, and the goats at His left.

"Then the King will say to those at His right,

" 'Come, my Father's blessed ones, receive your inheritance of the Kingdom which has been divinely intended for you ever since the creation of the world. For when I was hungry, you gave me food; when I was thirsty, you gave me drink; when I was homeless, you gave me welcome; when I was ill-clad, you clothed me; when I was sick, you visited me; when I was in prison, you came to see me.'

" 'When, Lord,' the righteous will reply, 'did we see Thee hungry, and feed Thee; or thirsty, and give Thee drink? When

did we see Thee homeless, and give Thee a welcome? or ill-clad, and clothe thee?'

"But the King will answer them,

" 'In solemn truth I tell you that in so far as you rendered such services to one of the humblest of these my brethren you rendered them to me.'

"Then will He say to those at His left,

" 'Begone from me, with the curse resting upon you, into the Fire of the Ages, which has been prepared for the Devil and his angels. For when I was hungry, you gave me nothing to eat; when thirsty, you gave me nothing to drink; when homeless you gave me no welcome; ill-clad, you clothed me not; sick or in prison, you visited me not.'

"Then will they also answer,

" 'Lord, when did we see Thee hungry, or thirsty, or homeless, or ill-clad, or sick, or in prison, and not come to serve Thee?'

"But he will reply,

" 'In solemn truth I tell you that in so far as you withheld such services from one of the humblest of these, you withheld them from me.'

"And these shall go away into the Punishment of the Ages, but the righteous into the Life of the Ages" (Matt. 25: 31-46).

**The Social Duties of a Christian Nation**

Nations nominally Christian cast reflection on the Christian religion by a failure to recognize or perform social duties in relation to other peoples. Of all, at certain times, it has been truly said, "They wish to be free, but know not how to be just." Kesub Chunder Sen, a leader in India, showed a keen insight when he said, "To be a Christian, then, is to be Christlike—not acceptance of Christ as a proposition, or as an outward representation; but spiritual conformity with the life and character of Christ. . . . Allow me, friends, to say that England is not yet a Christian nation." It is reported that when Dr. David Starr Jordan went from the United States to Japan as a representative of the World Peace Foundation he was cordially received, but it is not to be wondered at that the Japanese press remarked the inconsistency of a country that, while holding peace congresses and sending out workers in the interests of peace, should continue to increase equipments for war. In what ways can Christianity be applied by nations that are truly Christian?

**The Latest Peace Movement**

The latest and most important action toward sustaining amicable relations and averting war between the United States and other nations, known as the Wilson-Bryan Peace Plan, came to a remarkable consummation in the first months of the European War. It makes use of the Commission of Inquiry, which as a pacific method had been discussed in the Hague Conferences and was first brought forward by the late Frederick de Martens, the great jurisconsult of the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs,

whose work in international law will contribute much in future developments. Such a commission has three distinct advantages; it secures an investigation of the disputed facts, it gives time for consideration before war is declared, and it allows for the influence of public opinion. The proposed peace plan suggested one year for investigations before any hostile action should begin, and the remarkable result attained by March, 1915—just two years after the first proposition—shows "Treaties of Delay" in force with eleven states, signed by twenty others, while acceptance in principle has been made by an additional five—in all thirty-six governments which are willing to learn the facts before deciding to enter on war.* In leading in this action the United States has fulfilled an international social duty toward the larger and the smaller nations that may be followed by others, until, in the very postponement of war through righteous methods, peace shall be established. The fact that so many of the people of this country are connected by ties of blood with those of the Old World makes it the more likely that the sentiments nourished here may have their influence there.

**The Kingdom of God on Earth**

Christian society at large has often lost sight of its ideal—the kingdom of God *on earth*—but the day is dawning even amid dark and heavy clouds, when after great upheaval and much sacrifice, the ideal shall become a reality. The supreme motive and aspiration of Jesus was "the Reign of God," and—"God is love." What is it that will bring the answer to the prayer "Thy Kingdom come"? When the law of love is fulfilled in social relations the cities of the State will become "The City of God."

"Trumpeter, sound for the splendor of God!
Sound the music whose name is law,
Whose service is perfect freedom still,
The order august that rules the stars!
Bid the anarchs of might withdraw.
Too long the destroyers have worked their will.
Sound for the last, the last of the wars!
Sound for the heights that our fathers trod,
When truth was truth and love was love,
With a hell beneath, but a heaven above,
Trumpeter, rally us, rally us, rally us,
On the city of God."

* Full information on the Commission of Inquiry and the Wilson-Bryan Peace Plan may be obtained from a pamphlet by Denys P. Myers, distributed freely by the World Peace Foundation, Boston.

## LESSON XII

## THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CHRISTIAN

Study Matt. 23: 29-39

### The Meaning of Christian Patriotism

What is Christian patriotism? Is there any allegiance that is broader than that which an individual owes to his country? Does being a Christian modify one's patriotism? If so, how? What are the relations which a true follower of Jesus Christ sustains toward the other human beings and which would interfere with his recognizing only those bonds that bind him to his fellow citizens? Charles Sumner once said: "Not that I love country less, but humanity more, do I now and here plead the cause of a higher and truer patriotism. I cannot forget that we are men by a more sacred bond than we are citizens—that we are children of a common Father more than we are Americans." There are common interests that bind together all Americans. What are some of the common interests that should bind together the members of the whole human family regardless of nationality?

### The Practical Difficulty

The great difficulty seems to be not so much that of pointing out the human bonds that transcend all nationalities and races as it is that of securing practical recognition of these bonds in the everyday affairs of men. Men seem to understand—to know—that they all are brothers, but their hearts contain so many selfish sentiments that in actual conduct these ideas are crowded aside. The art of being kind is not mastered because the art of making money or of achieving leadership monopolizes practically all of one's time and thought. Individual welfare comes before race welfare so much of the time that the majority of man's sentiments are built up around the former rather than the latter. Thus these narrower ideas and sentiments become dominant. The ordinary citizen is so limited in his range of observation, interest, and sympathy that world-ideas and world-sentiments fail to be built up in his life.

### A Limited Sense of Responsibility

The world as a whole has not been brought to the attention of the ordinary citizen in such a way that he feels world-responsibility. He knows his home and is interested in it. He loves it and works for it. He knows his community also—not as well as his home, perhaps, but nevertheless, well enough to feel a sense of responsibility for its welfare. Now and then national affairs are brought to his attention and he takes a part in them. His

sense of responsibility as a citizen is seen on election days and national holidays. But the world, as such, has no anniversaries or election days. It is not as easy to act the part of a world-citizen as it is that of a citizen of a certain nation or city. There are fewer ideas upon which or out of which to create intelligent interest in and a sense of duty toward all the nations. Can a man's sense of responsibility reach beyond his information? If he does not know the world, as a whole world, can he be expected to be active in its behalf? How may this sense of world responsibility best be developed?

**The Responsibility of the Obscure Christian Citizen**

In view of the past history of the relations between nations, it is not strange that the "ordinary modest citizen in humble private station, remote from the diplomatic circles of Washington, is inclined to imagine that affairs of international magnitude do not concern him, that they belong to the secrets of state, that his ignorance and lack of political influence excuse him from responsibility in such high and complicated matters." But one of the great needs of the present hour is to make all such private citizens see their vital relation to such affairs. In a nation where the government is of the people, by the people and for the people, all of the activities of the government, international as well as internal, should be a concern of the people. The government should be servant and not master. It should be treated as such. The obscurity of a citizen does not sever his vital relationships to his government. The international relations of a nation should reflect the conscience and the intelligence of its citizens. The question is: What do the people want and how badly do they want it?

**How Can Good Will Become Efficient?**

The individual whose spirit is that of helpfulness and brotherliness is confronted with a task unknown in ancient times. It is this: How can I project this attitude of good will, of intelligent interest so that it will benefit all those who are within reach? In his "Psalm of the Helpers," Henry van Dyke writes:

He that turneth from the road to rescue another,
Turneth toward his goal;
He shall arrive in due time by the foot-path of mercy,
God will be his guide.

He that taketh up the burden of the fainting,
Lighteneth his own load;
The Almighty will put His arms underneath him,
He shall lean upon the Lord.

He that speaketh comfortable words to mourners,
Healeth his own heart;
In times of grief they will return to remembrance,
God will use them for balm.

He that careth for the sick and wounded,
Watcheth not alone:
There are three in the darkness together
And the third is the Lord.

Blessed is the way of the helpers:
The companions of the Christ.

For one individual to help another in this direct way seems to be a simpler matter than it was before the time of the complex modern relationships. But rescue work is now done by well organized missions. It is in the hospitals that the sick and wounded are best cared for. The ultimate causes of the excessive burdens carried by the fainting—who can discover? The efficient moral as well as industrial units are constantly enlarging. In national affairs, the one who seeks to work independently of his fellow citizens, lacks prudence. Cooperation is the watchword of the hour. To further the cause of peace most effectively, it is necessary to work with peace agencies. The man with a right motive must still find the right group with whom to work. To what extent is the opposition to the Peace Movement organized? What are some of the methods of this opposition? How can they be met?

**Practical Idealism**

The progress of civilization reveals the fact that an increasingly large number of people are looking upon social ideals from the standpoint of actual present conditions. It is not the one who has the greatest and most remote visions who is apt to secure the largest number of followers. The one who is merely visionary is sure to be unpopular. He is looked upon with suspicion. The other-worldly saint is sure to be reminded of the victories and defeats of the cause of truth in this world. The true saint does not pray to be taken out of the present world, but to be saved from the evil that is near at hand. The real task is to Christianize the present order of affairs. God is deeply interested in things as they are. He is immanent in the present-day forces that make for peace and righteousness. To ignore these forces is to ignore Him. Wholly to separate oneself from the world is to make cooperation with God impossible. Sainthood, to be genuine, must have practical value. How can Christian people be made to feel that they are a vital part of the Kingdom-of-God enterprise, and that the defeat of the cause of peace is in a true sense their own personal and individual defeat? How can they be made to feel their responsibility for the sins of international hatred and revenge?

**The Life of the Patriot**

The death of the patriot on the battlefield is no longer looked upon as the symbol of the highest patriotic devotion of a citizen. The nation's crises are not always sudden and spectacular. The

most gigantic conflicts are often those that involve ideas and convictions that have slowly become enthroned in the hearts of a multitude and crystallized in a morally courageous leader. Jenkin Lloyd Jones sings:

So he died for his faith. That is fine—
More than most of us do.
But stay, can you add to that line
That he lived for it, too?

It is easy to die. Men have died
For a wish or a whim—
From bravado or passion or pride.
Was it harder for him?

But to live; every day to live out
All the truth that he dreamt,
While his friends met his conduct with doubt
And the world with contempt—

Was it thus that he plodded ahead,
Never turning aside?
Then we'll talk of the life that he led—
Never mind how he died.

What facts make it easier to die for one's country than to live for it? How can patriotic living become more popular and prevalent than it now is? Until men and women catch the spirit of Paul and are willing to die daily (see 1 Cor. 15: 31) for the cause of Christ, the greatest enemies of humanity will not be overthrown.

**Does God Use Nations as Instruments of Righteousness?**

Is it right for a Christian, under any circumstances, to take up arms? If so, what are some of those circumstances? If a nation is bent on evil and undertakes, aggressively, to place its own interests in opposition to those of the Kingdom of God, what else is there for a Christian citizen to do but to become a part of an organized force that seeks to resist the aggressor? Channing once said: "When a government becomes an engine of oppression the Scriptures enjoin subjection no longer. Expediency may make it our duty to obey, but the government has lost its rights; it can no longer urge its claims as an ordinance of God." The prophets of Israel were accustomed to think of God as using one nation as an instrument by which to punish another. As a result of the wickedness of Israel, God, speaking through his prophet Amos, said: "For, behold, I will raise up against you a nation, O house of Israel, saith Jehovah, the God of hosts; and they shall afflict you from the entrance of Hamath unto the brook of the Arabah" (Amos 6: 14). How is it possible to reconcile this prophetic utterance with Jesus' thought contained in the parable of the wheat and the tares? (See Matt. 13: 24-30.)

### A Divine Plan for Every Nation

One of the greatest immediate needs in the further advancement of the cause of international peace is that each individual citizen find a religious, indeed, a Christian motive for all of his political acts. National consciousness should be permeated with a sense of a national destiny that is appointed of God. The truly Christian citizen should be able to discover and to appreciate the hand of God in the history of his own nation. In a real sense one's native country should seem to be called of God to make a definite contribution to the welfare of the race. The Jews never thought of their nation as being outside of the plans and clearly announced purpose of God. In Stephen's review of his nation's history as given in Acts 7: 1-60, notice how intimately he considered God's purpose to have been identified with the history of the Jewish nation. Amos, the prophet, had a similar conception of God's relation to his nation: "I brought you up out of the land of Egypt, and led you forty years in the wilderness, to possess the land of the Amorite. And I raised up of your sons for prophets, and of your young men for Nazarites. Is it not even thus, O ye children of Israel?" (Amos 2: 10, 11.) Is there a divine plan for every nation? If each nation follows its own God-given plan, will international strifes be avoided? What is God's will for the United States of America as related to the other nations?

### The Fusing of Patriotism and Religion

It is this definite conception of God's purpose for a nation that helps to establish a standard of national conduct. The ancient Hebrew citizens and statesmen judged of the meaning of the national events from the point of view of their bearing upon the nation's fulfilling its divine mission. Their devotion to their nation reflected their loyalty to Jehovah. The two were inseparable. National prosperity and safety were thought of as dependent upon obedience to God. God's particular interest in them as a nation increased their political responsibilities. The gravest national danger was that the citizens might forget God. The highest credential of patriotism was religious fidelity. The most terrible arraignment of the Jewish nation was spoken by Christ as He viewed the capital city: "Alas for you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, for you repair the sepulchres of the Prophets and keep in order the tombs of the righteous, and your boast is, 'If we had lived in the time of our forefathers, we should not have been implicated with them in the murder of the Prophets.' So that you bear witness against yourselves that you are descendants of those who murdered the Prophets. Fill up the measure of your forefathers' guilt. O serpents, O vipers' brood, how are you to escape condemnation to Gehenna? For this reason I am sending to you Prophets and wise men and Scribes. Some of them you will put to death—nay, crucify; some of them you will flog in your synagogues and chase from town

to town; that all the innocent blood shed upon earth may come on you, from the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zechariah the son of Berechiah whom you murdered between the sanctuary and the altar. I tell you in solemn truth that all these things will come upon the present generation. O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou who murderest the Prophets and stonest those who have been sent to thee: how often have I desired to gather thy children to me, just as a hen gathers her chickens under her wings, and you would not come! See, your house will now be left to you desolate! For I tell you that you will never see me again until you say, 'Blessed be He who comes in the name of the Lord'" (Matt. 23: 29-39). What are some of the events that have temporarily defeated God's plan for this nation? What national events have furthered the divine purpose?

## LESSON XIII

## CHRIST THE ULTIMATE BASIS AND ASSURANCE OF PERMANENT INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL

Study Mark 12: 29-31; Matt. 20: 25-28; Rev. 21: 1-8

### Jesus Christ the Prince of Peace

Of all the leaders of the peace movement there is none whose influence is comparable with that of Jesus Christ. His influence upon men is such that he has earned the title, Prince of Peace. One of the fundamental truths of his kingdom as enunciated in the Sermon on the Mount is: "Blessed are the Peacemakers, for it is they who will be recognized as sons of God." At his birth a multitude of the heavenly army sang a hymn of praise: "Glory to God in the highest heavens, and on earth peace among men who please Him!" And the marvelous fact is that in the course of the centuries the singing of this hymn on this occasion is becoming more and more widely recognized as being appropriate in view of his character and ministry. As the world's burden of militarism increases and as the destructiveness of modern warfare becomes more appalling, it is coming to be more evident that the only adequate ground for hope of the ultimate reign of peace on earth is the one of whom Paul wrote: "He is our peace."

### Jesus's Emphasis Upon Love

The message of Jesus to the men of His day was one of reconciliation and restoration. The most emphatic note in his message was that of love which unites man to God and man to his fellow-men. He intensified the bonds of brotherhood. He taught men to forgive one another. He set before His disciples a seemingly impossible task in the following: "I command you all, love your enemies, and pray for your persecutors; that so you may become true sons of your Father in Heaven" (Matt. 5: 44). The best short summary of His teaching is found in His reply to one of the Scribes:

" 'The chief commandment,' replied Jesus, 'is this: "Hear, O ISRAEL! THE LORD OUR GOD IS ONE LORD; AND THOU SHALT LOVE THE LORD THY GOD WITH THY WHOLE HEART, THY WHOLE SOUL, THY WHOLE MIND, AND THY WHOLE STRENGTH" (Deut. 6: 4, 5).

" 'The second is this: "THOU SHALT LOVE THY FELLOW MAN AS THOU LOVEST THYSELF" (Lev. 19: 10).

" 'Other Commandment greater than these there is none' " (Mark 12: 29-31).

What is the difference between "fellow man" and neighbor?

Is it practicable always to treat as fellow men all who live in the neighborhood?

**A Spirit of Friendliness**

It is significant that when the hostile Jews wished to turn public sentiment against Jesus, one of the methods used was to accuse him of excessive hospitality. He was friendly to social outcasts. "See this man," they exclaimed—"a friend of tax-gatherers and notorious sinners" (Matt. 10: 19). His sympathy was so broad that it included those who were usually thought of as being unworthy of friendly treatment. He drew men to himself with such bonds of personal loyalty that they faced death rather than give up their allegiance to Him. Those who caught His spirit were bound together into a society the vitality of which is seen in the world-wide Christian fraternity of to-day. He said to his followers: "You are my friends." "It is not you who chose me but it is I who chose you" (John 15: 14, 15). This spirit of Christian friendliness is gradually laying the foundation of a social organization that will endure forever, and which will include the entire human race. What political kingdom founded at the time of Jesus' earthly ministry has continued until to-day? Has it been historically true that kingdoms founded on love are more enduring than those founded upon force?

**Jesus as the Saviour from Sin**

Jesus Christ took upon himself the burden of the world's sin. He had a divine appreciation of the fact that hatred, strife, mutual distrust, selfishness, greed, and other forms of sin stand in the way of the reign of peace among men. Hence his passionate endeavor to rid the human heart of these weaknesses. It is sin that makes it impossible for men to appreciate that fullness of life, that life in Christ, which is naturally peaceable, gentle, kind, and charitable. For all individuals who have come to have an appreciation of the true nature of sin and have earnestly desired to be free from its blighting influence, Jesus Christ has provided a way of salvation. It is because of his power to save men from those passions and other weaknesses that lead to war that he has made possible a vision of a world-wide society founded upon brotherly kindness, justice, and righteousness. It is he who has opened up the way for intimate communion and fellowship between every member of all the nations of earth and the God of justice, mercy, and truth. He revealed a Father's divine love and taught men how to reciprocate that love. What hope of final world peace can there be as long as men in great numbers are content to live sinful lives? Will the awful destructiveness of modern warfare give the world a new appreciation of sin and its results? Does war have any effect upon the religious life of a nation? What hope is there that the warlike nations will ever repent of their sins?

### The Christian Appreciation of Human Values

Wherever the teachings of Christ have gone and men have seriously undertaken to live in accordance with them, there has resulted a new appreciation of the worth of human life. Tenderness has marked the new attitude toward childhood; womankind has been treated with respect; the sacredness of the family has been established; a sense of responsibility for the welfare of the neighborhood and community has been quickened; labor has taken on new dignity; waste and destruction of natural resources have been condemned; parenthood has been purified and exalted; in fact all of the natural human relationships have had a higher appreciation. The result is that anything that tends to mar or to destroy them meets with a new resistance. In the time of savagery, men did not oppose war on moral grounds. Is it reasonable to suppose that with the advancement of Christianity the opposition to war will become increasingly determined and persistent? What assurance is there that it will finally become adequate to abolish war as a method of settling international differences? If a nation does not place a value upon human relations such as to make it avoid war whenever possible, can that nation be called truly Christian? Why is it untrue to say that Christianity has failed in those nations that are the aggressors in beginning war?

### Christ's Law of Service

One of the results of the influence of Jesus Christ is that his followers discover an ever enlarging number of bonds that unite them to all members of the human family. Moreover, the bonds already recognized are given a higher moral quality. There was no individual with whom Jesus came in contact who might not have been benefited by him. He pitied the poor and the needy. He comforted those in distress. He helped those who were in need of assistance. He expressed appreciation of and admiration for those whose personal worth warranted it. The deepest motive in all his conduct was to do good to others. His immediate followers reflected this benevolent attitude. What is to prevent its becoming characteristic of all mankind? Which will ultimately prevail—the Christian standard of service or the heathen standard of lordship and domination? "Jesus called them to Him, and said, 'You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great men exercise authority over them. Not so shall it be among you: but whoever desires to be great among you shall be your servant, and whoever desires to be first among you shall be your bondservant; just as the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give His life as the redemption price for many'" (Matt. 20: 25-28). Shailer Mathews once wrote: "If the Golden Rule is inoperative outside pious books, let us be honest with ourselves and say so. If reconciliation between men is less possible than reconciliation with God, let us say that also. Only let us also not deceive our-

selves in another particular. Let us be honest and label ourselves heathen."

### Christ or Force

It would seem then that Christianity is absolutely opposed to the principle of superiority through force. The two are eternally contradictory. William Leighton Grane says: "One thing seems certain. Not this nation or that, but the whole civilized world will ere long be forced to a decision between the ruinous worship of Force and the beneficent worship of God. Two masters cannot be served forever. Two opposite opinions cannot be eternally maintained. The time comes when it is no longer possible to continue to keep both, and it is necessary to ally oneself with either one or the other. No compromise is possible between Christ and Nietzsche. Multitudes even now are mustering in the Valley of Decision. And before them lies the most momentous choice yet proposed in the course of the social evolution of the world." What are some of the influences that are causing multitudes of men to choose Christ and service rather than Satan and force? Which ideal makes the more profound appeal to the imagination of the common people? With the religion that will ultimately become the universal religion, opposed to war, is there any advocate of force who can ultimately succeed? How is it that the nations who believe in war will tend to disappear as factors in this final struggle? How will the instinctive love of liberty finally affect this struggle?

### The Influence of the Church of Christ

It is estimated that "the clergy of the United States number approximately one hundred and seventy-five thousand, and there are, perhaps, about three times as many in Europe, exclusive of Russia—seven hundred thousand in all" (see George Holley Gilbert, The Bible and Universal Peace, page 202). The influence of this great body of educated men upon public opinion is a factor that must be taken into account. These ministers and their successors will exert a vast influence upon the thoughts and the convictions of Christendom. Their position and office gives them unusual influence with the masses of men. Their utterances are for the most part vitally related to the immediate problems of their people. The attitude of the Christian pulpits toward slavery did much to reinforce the convictions of those who listened to them. The clergy, for the most part, may be counted upon to be true to the message of their divine Master. Already there are signs of their awakening to the great need of the abolition of war. Is there any equally numerous body of men who can counteract the influence of the clergy? How will the women of the churches reenforce the messages of the ministers? In what ways are the churches already becoming active in the advocacy of international good will?

### The Religious Motive of the Peace Movement

The powerful influence of religion as a motive in conduct has already been illustrated in the so-called "Religious wars." Back of the Crusades was the desire to rescue the Holy Land from the infidels, who had political control of it. Is the desire to protect human life from the further ravages of war a cause less holy? Is God less interested in it? Is He less likely to be thought of as giving aid to those who labor for it? If the followers of Jesus Christ become convinced of the fact that war must be abolished before the Kingdom of God can be established among men and that in the advancement of that kingdom, their immediate duty is to establish the substitutes for war, what resources will become available for the peace movement? If all the Christian resources of intelligence, material wealth, personal influence with men, and prayer were concentrated upon the solution of this problem, how long would it remain unsolved? The solution of every such question is, ultimately, moral. Is Christianity yet fully convinced of the inherent wickedness of war? What hope is there that this conviction will ultimately prevail?

### Christian Morality the Touchstone

"Christian morality is the touchstone to which war must now be brought; for if it cannot justify itself to the modern Christ, it surely cannot any longer command the approbation of modern Christendom. Reference to ancient texts and traditions may help certain minds, and may have brought us part of the way; but it is surely now possible to take our stand upon the historical development of the Christian consciousness, and claim that it demands the substitution of reason for violence, and the triumph of moral over physical forces" (Moral Damage of War, Walsh, page 4).

### The New Faith and the New Earth

One of the powerful forces now at work in human life—in as far as that life has come under the sway of the Gospel message—is the hope and eager expectation of the final triumph of Jesus Christ. This vision of hope quickens the imagination and stimulates innumerable desires. "Come, Lord Jesus; hasten thy coming" is the thought frequently heard from the pious lips of prayerful Christians. The vision of John seems to be not inappropriate as one meditates on this ultimate triumph of goodwill. "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth were gone, and the sea no longer exists. And I saw the Holy City, the new Jerusalem, coming down out of Heaven from God and made ready like a bride attired to meet her husband. And I heard a loud voice, which came from the throne, say:

'God's dwelling place is among men
And He will dwell among them
And they shall be His peoples.
Yes, God Himself will be among them.
He will wipe every tear from their eyes
Death shall be no more;
Nor sorrow, no wail of woe, nor pain;
For the first things have passed away.'

"Then He who was seated on the throne said,
" 'I am re-creating all things.'
"And He added,
" 'Write down these words, for they are trustworthy and true.'
"He also said,
" 'They have now been fulfilled. I am the Alpha and the Omega, the Beginning and the End. To those who are thirsty, I will give the privilege of drinking from the well of the Water of Life without payment. All this shall be the heritage of him who overcomes, and I will be his God and he shall be one of My sons. But as for cowards and the unfaithful, and the polluted, and murderers, fornicators, and those who practice magic or worship idols, and all liars—the portion allotted to them shall be in the Lake which burns with fire and sulphur. This is the second death' " (Rev. 21: 1-8).

**Jesus Christ the Ultimate Hope**

It is the Christian's hope that some day the recognized dwelling place of God will be among men. He will dwell among them. They shall be recognized as His people. But before that day the intense spirit of modern nationalism must enlarge until it takes in all nations. The vision of world-wide fraternity will have to be universally appreciated. The courage and self-sacrifice now finding expression in war will find other kinds of activity that will in no way lessen their moral value. World organization must be an accomplished fact before death, sorrow, the wail of woe, and pain shall have passed away. Interracial appreciation and good will must gradually permeate all peoples. At the very heart of this broad movement is Jesus Christ. Its efficient cause is found in the individual's loyalty to Him. Wherever this relationship is intelligent and vital, the conditions of permanent peace are fulfilled. What methods should the churches adopt in order that Christ may take up His abode in the hearts of men? Why is this the great immediate task of the church?

## ORGANIZATIONS SUPPLYING LITERATURE ON THE PEACE MOVEMENT

American Association for International Conciliation, organized 1906. Secretary, Frederick P. Keppel, 407 West 117th Street, New York City. Pamphlet publications, beginning in April, 1907, distributed free up to the limit of editions.

American Peace Society, founded 1815-1828. Secretary, Benjamin F. Trueblood; executive director, Arthur Deerin Call, Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. The "Advocate of Peace," a monthly publication, is the organ of the society. The subscription price is $1 per year. From this society may be obtained many pamphlets and reports.

American Society for the Judicial Settlement of International Disputes, founded in 1910. Secretary, James Brown Scott, 2 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C. Pamphlet publications, issued quarterly, are sent free to any address. Applications should be made to the assistant secretary, Tunstall Smith, The Preston, Baltimore, Md.

Church Peace Union, founded by Andrew Carnegie, 1913. Secretary, Rev. Frederick Lynch, D.D., 70 Fifth Avenue, New York. Issues a series of pamphlets with the general title of "The Church and International Peace," and other publications; sent free on request.

Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, 105 East 22d Street, New York City. Dr. Charles S. Macfarland, Secretary. Literature supplied through the Commission on Peace and Arbitration. Rev. Sidney L. Gulick, Associate Secretary.

National Peace Council. Secretary, Carl Heath, 167 St. Stephen's House, Westminster, S. W., London. A central body, representing 180 organizations. Publishes many pamphlets.

The Peace Society, founded in 1816. Secretary, Dr. W. Evans Darby, 47 New Broad Street, London, E. C. Publishes many pamphlets.

World Peace Foundation, founded by Edwin Ginn, of Boston, in 1909, as the International School of Peace; reorganized and incorporated under the present name in 1910. Chief director, Edwin D. Mead, 40 Mt. Vernon Street, Boston, Mass. Publishes a series

of pamphlets and the volumes of an International Library. Single copies of the pamphlet issues may be obtained gratuitously.

World's Student Christian Federation (Fédération Universelle des Étudiants Chrétiens), the outgrowth of the international activities of the Y. M. C. A. The moving spirit is Dr. John R. Mott, and the central office is in the Y. M. C. A. Building at 124 East 28th Street, New York. Organ: "The Student World," quarterly, per annum 25 cents. Dr. Mott is also president of the "Continuation Committee" of the World Missionary Conference of All Protestant Churches, office 1 Charlotte Square, Edinburgh, which publishes quarterly "The International Review of Missions."

World's Young Women's Christian Association. Office of general secretary, 26 George Street, Hanover Square, London. Organ: "The World's Y. W. C. A. Quarterly"; subscription, per annum, 6d.

## BOOKS RELATING TO THE PEACE MOVEMENT OF THE CHURCHES

Published by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America

Christian Unity at Work—4th Edition. The Second Council, of 1912. Edited by Charles S. Macfarland, Secretary of the Federal Council. Price, $1.00 net; postpaid, $1.20.

The Fight for Peace—An Aggressive Campaign for American Churches. By Sidney L. Gulick. Paper, 25 cents; postpaid, 30 cents. Cloth, 50 cents; postpaid, 55 cents.

The Japanese Problem in the United States—A Report prepared for the Commission on Relations with Japan by Professor H. A. Millis. Price, $1.50; postpaid, $1.60.

A Yearbook of the Church and Social Service. Price, paper, 30 cents; postpaid, 35 cents. Cloth, 50 cents; postpaid, 55 cents.

The Annual Reports of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America for 1914. Postpaid, 20 cents.

A Course of Twelve Lessons prepared by the Commission on Christian Education, giving the lessons in brief form and containing an unusually complete bibliography of the peace movement.

Pamphlet literature is constantly issued by the Commission on Peace and Arbitration of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.